

**THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA**

Monday, July 12, 1999

7:00 P.M. Regular Session

MINUTES

Place: Commissioners' Room, second floor, Durham County Government
Administrative Complex, 200 E. Main Street, Durham, NC

Present: Chairman MaryAnn E. Black, Vice-Chairman Ellen W. Reckhow, and
Commissioners William V. Bell, Joe W. Bowser, and Becky M. Heron

Absent: None

Presider: Chairman Black

Opening of Regular Session

Chairman Black called the Regular Session to order with the Pledge of Allegiance.

Agenda Adjustments

Chairman Black added one item to the agenda relative to the salaries of the five employees the Commissioners' evaluated. This item was placed on the agenda before Board and Commission Appointments as No. 12.5.

Chairman Black also added that before the consent agenda, a resolution would be read into the record for Michael J. Palmer, Deputy County Manager.

Minutes

Commissioner Heron moved, seconded by Commissioner Bowser, to approve the June 2, 1999 Worksession and the June 14, 1999 Northern Durham Parkway Public Hearing Minutes of the Board as submitted.

The motion carried unanimously.

Resolution

Chairman Black read the following resolution into the record:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, Michael J. Palmer began his 12-year affiliation with Durham County Government in August 1987, when he was hired as an Internal Auditor in the Finance Department; and

WHEREAS, he quickly became recognized for his leadership skills and strong professional abilities and was promoted to the position of Internal Audit Manager in January 1989; and

WHEREAS, Michael Palmer continued to demonstrate his technical skills as he worked hard to assist in the orderly financial operations of the County, particularly in the area of managing the County's two successful multimillion-dollar bond issues; and

WHEREAS, as a result of his strong work ethic and his keen ability to motivate employees, he was named Internal Audit Manager/Assistant County Manager in August 1990; and

WHEREAS, while the demands of his position were great, he nevertheless volunteered in the community by working with students at area schools, particularly Y. E. Smith Elementary, coaching a variety of sports, and participating in various organizations including, Durham Rotary, YMCA, Red Cross, the Partnership for Children, and the Museum of Life and Science; and

WHEREAS, the Durham Board of County Commissioners appointed Mr. Palmer as Interim County Manager in November 1995, and County Manager David F. Thompson named him as Durham County's first Deputy County Manager in May 1996; and

WHEREAS, Michael Palmer has positively impacted the Durham community through committed, visionary, innovative, and insightful leadership, he will be remembered for his tremendous motivational skills, for his listening ear and open door, for his sense of humor, as a mentor to countless students and employees, and for his compassion for all:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that we, the members of the Durham County Board of Commissioners, do hereby congratulate

MICHAEL J. PALMER

for 12 years of dedicated service to Durham County Government and for the numerous, invaluable contributions he has made to improve the quality of life for the Durham community. We wish for him a wealth of success as he begins a new journey as Director of Duke University's Office of Community Affairs.

This the 12th day of July, 1999.

/s/ Five Commissioners
Durham County Commissioners

Mr. Palmer made remarks of thanks and appreciation for the resolution that the Commissioners presented him. He made remarks about his departure.

The Commissioners made remarks of appreciation for his service to Durham County and its citizens. They congratulated him on his appointment as Director of Duke University's Office of Community Affairs.

Chairman Black presented to Mr. Palmer the resolution she read into the record.

Consent Agenda

Commissioner Bowser moved, seconded by Vice-Chairman Reckhow, to approve the following consent agenda items:

- (a) Appointment—Criminal Justice Partnership Board (appoint Evester Bailey as the Durham Center's representative, replacing Carolyn Titus);
- (b) Appointment—NCACC Annual Conference Voting Delegate (appoint Chairman Black as the voting delegate and Vice-Chairman Reckhow as the alternate
- * (c) Durham Open Space and Trails Commission matching grants recommendation (approve the five projects listed for funding and allocate \$95,261 from "Pay-As-You-Go Capital" funds:

Birchwood Homeowners Association Tot Lot	\$18,200
Burton Geo World Elementary PTA Playground	\$13,164
Club Boulevard School PTA Playground	\$ 5,226
Ellerbe Creek Watershed Association Urban Reserve	\$32,000
RN Harris Elementary PTA Learning Environment	\$26,671);
- (d) Standard non-reimbursable utility contract for extension or upgrade of the county sanitary sewer system (authorize the County Manager to execute the utility contracts listed: Auman Pond Subdivision, Edinborough In The Park, and Hopson/Page/Slater Roads Extension/Relocation Project);
- (e) Amendment to the FY 1999-2000 Annual Ordinance for Court Order Care contracts (approve the amendment to the FY 1999-2000 Budget Ordinance to allow the County Manager to enter into service contracts in excess of \$20,000 for the purpose of providing treatment services to court-ordered care for children); and

- (f) Approval to purchase Emergency Medical Services (EMS) hardware/software (authorize the County Manager to enter into the necessary contracts and appropriate the requested funds from the Pay-As-You-Go fund).

The motion carried unanimously.

*Documents related to these items follow:

Consent Agenda 4(c). Durham Open Space and Trails Commission matching grants recommendation (approve the five projects listed for funding and allocate \$95,261 from "Pay-As-You-Go Capital" funds:

Birchwood Homeowners Association Tot Lot	\$18,200
Burton Geo World Elementary PTA Playground	\$13,164
Club Boulevard School PTA Playground	\$ 5,226
Ellerbe Creek Watershed Association Urban Reserve	\$32,000
RN Harris Elementary PTA Learning Environment	\$26,671).

The Capital Projects Ordinance Amendment follows:

DURHAM COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA
 FY 1999-00 Capital Projects Budget Ordinance
 Amendment No. 99CPA000001

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COMMISSIONERS OF DURHAM COUNTY that the FY 1999-00 Capital Projects Budget Ordinance is hereby amended to reflect budget adjustments for the Open Space Matching Grants pay-as-you-go project.

PAYG FUND

	<u>Current</u> <u>Budget</u>	<u>Increase</u>	<u>Decrease</u>	<u>Revised</u> <u>Budget</u>
Open Space Matching Grants	\$ -0-	\$95,261		\$95,261

All ordinances and portions of ordinances in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

This the 12th day of July, 1999.

(Capital Projects Budget Ordinance Amendment recorded in Ordinance Book _____, page _____.)

Consent Agenda 4(e). Amendment to the FY 1999-2000 Annual Ordinance for Court Order Care contracts (approve the amendment to the FY 1999-2000 Budget Ordinance to

allow the County Manager to enter into service contracts in excess of \$20,000 for the purpose of providing treatment services to court-ordered care for children).

The amendment follows:

Section 5, Subsection d:

- enter consultant, professional or other service agreements within budgeted appropriations for the purpose of providing treatment services to children in the Juvenile Court system for which the County of Durham is ordered.

Consent Agenda 4(f). Approval to purchase Emergency Medical Services (EMS) hardware/software (authorize the County Manager to enter into the necessary contracts and appropriate the requested funds from the Pay-As-You-Go fund).

The Capital Projects Ordinance Amendment follows:

DURHAM COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA
FY 1999-00 Capital Projects Budget Ordinance
Amendment No. 99CPA000002

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COMMISSIONERS OF DURHAM COUNTY that the FY 1999-00 Capital Projects Budget Ordinance is hereby amended to reflect budget adjustments for the EMS Computer Technology Upgrade pay-as-you-go project.

PAYG FUND

	<u>Current Budget</u>	<u>Increase</u>	<u>Decrease</u>	<u>Revised Budget</u>
EMS Computer Technology Upgrade	\$ -0-	\$186,766		\$186,766

All ordinances and portions of ordinances in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

This the 12th day of July, 1999.

(Capital Projects Budget Ordinance Amendment recorded in Ordinance Book _____,
page _____.)

Establishment of an Official Transportation Level of Service Goal for Durham County

The County Commissioners deal with a number of different transportation issues from time to time. In reviewing these transportation matters, the Commissioners frequently deal with issues related to traffic congestion on major roadways throughout the county.

For example, Commissioners annually adopt priorities for the state's Transportation Improvement Program, which is particularly related to traffic congestion levels on roadways. The Commissioners are also considering a slowdown on approving major development proposals in the NC 54/I-40 area due to high congestion levels there.

Different Levels of Service are defined in both the Federal Highway Administration's *Highway Capacity Manual* and by national standards adopted by the Institute of Transportation Engineers, on a scale of A (best) to F (worst). Establishment of a transportation Level of Service goal could assist the Commissioners in better analyzing and more consistently reacting to issues related to traffic congestion. Staff recommends that the Board of County Commissioners adopt an official County transportation goal as Level of Service D.

County Attorney Chuck Kitchen and Bonnie Estes, Planning Manager, will present this item.

County Manager's Recommendation: The Board needs to hear from staff as to the benefits of establishing a transportation level of service goal for Durham County. Prior to adopting a Level of Service D, the Board needs to be made aware of what each service level means and how realistic it is to set a service level. Appropriate staff will be present to assist the Board through this deliberation.

Bonnie Estes was present to address questions that the Commissioners raised about the Level of Service (LOS).

County Attorney Chuck Kitchen pointed out to the Commissioners that part of the reason we need to do this is that the next agenda item will be discussing transportation development management and an ordinance. The LOS will serve as a benchmark by measuring the roads to see if they are measuring up to the goals you want to meet. If not, you can take measures to achieve those goals.

Bonnie Estes said this is a minimum goal we are trying to achieve.

Brian J. Morton, 4417 Sunny Court, said the measurable performance standard for transportation is a good idea. There are measures of performance other than LOS-F that are helpful, perhaps more helpful. For example--vehicle hours of delay and UMT. The LOS-AF measure implies that the average vehicle speed is the only criterion for evaluating the transportation system and it encourages highway construction and sprawl. The other measures that I mentioned provide a more direct measure of traffic congestion or correlate with motor vehicle emissions. He encouraged the Commissioners to undertake a more comprehensive, comparative analysis of the different ways of measuring performance before endorsing LOS.

Peter Schubert, 927 Bluestone Road, representing Carpenter Fletcher Neighborhood Association and CAUSE, said there are better measures to establish as a standard other than Level of Service. I encourage you to investigate these alternative measures in lieu of LOS. The best argument in favor of using LOS as a standard is due to it being connected to the traffic impact analysis process. If you choose to adopt LOS as a standard, do not set a grade of D as a goal. I strongly recommend that Durham adopt LOS C as the standard.

The Commissioners asked questions and made comments.

Vice-Chairman Reckhow suggested Mr. Brian Morton's comments are something to take up and referred to the TCC of the Transportation Advisory Committee because it is plotting new grounds.

Chairman Black agreed with Vice-Chairman Reckhow.

Vice-Chairman Reckhow moved, seconded by Commissioner Heron, to adopt Level of Service D as our minimum Level of Service goal for Durham County.

The motion carried unanimously.

A Public Hearing to Consider the Adoption of an Ordinance Which Places Limits on the Approvals of Major Developments in the NC 54/I-40 Area for Six Months

In recent months, there have been high levels of actual and anticipated development activity and increasing traffic congestion in the area along NC 54 and I-40 in Durham County west of RTP. These trends are continuing and are threatening the public safety in this area. At the same time, there are several studies going on or starting in the next six months that are trying to propose strategies to help deal with the growing problems in this area. The County is proposing to limit approvals on major projects during the next six months in order to allow more of these strategies to be better developed or put into place. Major projects would be defined as proposed developments that exceed the thresholds for Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) as shown in the Zoning Ordinance. The adoption of the ordinance would establish these limitations for a specific time period. The suggested time of the limitations would be from July 12, 1999 to December 31, 1999. The Zoning Committee of the Durham Planning Commission reviewed this matter on June 10, 1999 and recommended adoption by a 6-1 vote. Staff recommends that the Board hold a public hearing to receive comments on this matter and then consider adoption of the proposed ordinance, which limits approvals of those developments, which require a TIA.

County Manager's Recommendation: Adopt the ordinance.

Chairman Black recommended that the six-month period run from July 12, 1999 to January 12, 2000.

Bonnie Estes commented this proposal looks at traffic congestion on NC 54/I-40 west of Research Triangle Park. It proposes that those potential developments that have the largest impact on traffic would be delayed or a part of those approvals until work could be done within the jurisdiction to address the traffic impact of those large-scale developments. The smaller developments that do not have that large-scale traffic impact would continue through the approval process at a normal fashion.

The Commissioners asked staff questions for their response.

Vice-Chairman Reckhow said the job will be completed by December 31, 1999.

The Commissioners concurred to extend the six-month period of the ordinance to January 24, 2000 in lieu of January 12, 2000.

Commissioner Bell asked if there was a definitive description of the boundaries.

Ms. Estes responded that there is no surveyed line. We do have a larger scale map. It may be best to take the boundaries to physical features on the road. I would recommend that we go to the nearest property line nearest road away from the ½ point. The motion could say that the line will be carried out to the nearest road or property line, whichever is closest.

Chairman Black opened the public hearing that was properly advertised.

The following citizens spoke at the public hearing:

Amy Nail, 204 W. Lavender Avenue, representing the Sierra Club, asked the Commissioners to approve the six-month limit on the approval of major development in the I-40/NC 54 corridor. The club would like for the Commissioners to encourage alternative forms of transportation by the citizens. Building or expanding roads is not the solution to the problem of growth in the County. We would like to see the end of automobile dependent growth.

Fred Broadwell, 2707 Elgin Street, represented the Durham Peoples' Alliance. The Peoples' Alliance strongly endorses the concept of a NC 54/I-40 corridor development pause as laid out in the County's proposal. We applaud the courage of the County Commissioners for considering this action. This is a time limited and reasonable pause in the development which will not threaten needed economic development, but helps the community to plan for quality development. The Travel Demand Management Plan will help make more efficient use of the infrastructure.

Pat Bocckino, 7340 Abron Drive, representing CAUSE, said creative alternatives must be found for transportation. The proposal gives time to work on alternatives. She urged the Commissioners to approve the proposal that is being considered tonight.

Brian J. Morton, 4417 Sunny Court, representing the Environmental Affairs Board, said the board supports the limitation on major development approvals in the NC 54/I-40 corridor as proposed by the Board of County Commissioners. The board further supports the development of the Travel Demand Management Plan for the region and eventually for all of Durham County, with mandatory single-occupant auto trip reduction measures by major employers and retail developments. He urged the Commissioners to approve the ordinance.

Edward Harrison, 58 Newton Drive, representing the Cross-County Communities Association, said this is exciting, and he thanked the County for starting this. This is a funded action plan from the Department of Transportation and we should celebrate it.

Pete Schubert, 927 Bluestone Road, speaking on behalf of the Carpenter-Fletcher Neighborhood Association, expressed concern that the corridor in the northeast part as it nears the Research Triangle Park does not include Carpenter Fletcher Road. This issue is critical now with the extension of the Woodcroft Parkway just about under construction during the next six-month period. He urged the Board to redraw the boundary to include all of Carpenter-Fletcher Road and then adopt the ordinance. He urged City Council to approve the ordinance.

Patrick Byker, 2614 Stuart Drive, representing the Durham Chamber of Commerce, stated the employers and office developers are comfortable with the proposal you are considering tonight. I would urge you to support it in the form you have before you.

Jim McDonald, 3818 Somerset Drive, representing the Hope Valley Neighborhood Association, urged the Commissioners to adopt the proposal before you. The ordinance will give us a window of opportunity to address some very serious long-term problems.

Chip Radford, 836 Lake Forest Drive, Industrial and Commercial Properties, applauded the Commissioners for their decision to better define the boundaries on the map. Where is the boundary when you go south along the NC 55 corridor? I would say the CSX Railroad on the east side would be far enough on the eastern side.

Ms. Deborah G. Giles, 1015 Benning Street, submitted a memorandum for the record in support of the moratorium on new development in southern Durham County. This will be a prudent step to give you a period to grapple with growth issues for the entire county. There are some infrastructure issues such as water, public protection, and schools that warrant our attention and concern.

As no one else asked to speak at the public hearing, Chairman Black closed the hearing and referred the item to the Commissioners for consideration.

Vice-Chairman Reckhow moved, seconded by Commissioner Heron, that the Board adopt the revised ordinance that was distributed tonight that basically changes the title and we amend the ordinance to extend the period to January 24, 2000.

The motion carried unanimously.

The ordinance follows:

AN ORDINANCE CONCERNING APPLICATIONS
FOR CERTAIN DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES
WITHIN THE VICINITY OF INTERSTATE 40 AND NC 54
WEST OF RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK

WHEREAS, the Durham Board of County Commissioners finds that increased traffic in the vicinity of those portions of Interstate 40 [I-40] and North Carolina Route 54 [NC 54] west of the Research Triangle Park [RTP] has reached levels which have created adverse effects on these arterial highways as well as the entire transportation system in Durham, and

WHEREAS, the potential health and safety hazards of the increased traffic in this vicinity may jeopardize property values, and create public safety concerns for residents of Durham County due to loss of mobility, decreased air quality, longer response times for emergency vehicles, and increased accidents and noise, and

WHEREAS, the approval of large new developments in the vicinity of I-40 and NC 54 west of RTP directly affects the level of traffic using these two highways, and

WHEREAS, it is important that Durham County consider ordinance measures which will maintain and protect the health and safety of citizens from the adverse effects of traffic congestion in the vicinity of I-40 and NC 54, and

WHEREAS, Durham County will need approximately 6 months to study the issues described above and to consider proposals for changes in the development ordinances which address these issues, and

WHEREAS, it will negatively effect the public health, safety, and welfare to continue the approval of large-scale developments during this period of study:

NOW THEREFORE, the Board of Commissioners of Durham does ordain that:

SECTION 1

For the time period of July 12, 1999 to January 24, 2000 no applications shall be considered by the elected body which require a Traffic Impact Analysis [TIA] and which are located within an area defined on a map titled "I-40/NC 54 Study Area" and attached to this ordinance.

SECTION 2

That this ordinance shall become effective upon adoption.

Page Pointe Convenience—Site Plan Request

Spaulding Engineering, P.C., on behalf of Coryea Properties, LLC, is seeking approval of a site plan request to build a 2,275-square-foot convenience store on 1.17 acres. The site is located on the east side of Page Road and south of U.S. Highway 70. The site plan as submitted meets all current ordinance requirements. The Development Review Board, at its meeting on June 4, 1999, recommended approval subject to several technical corrections, which have been made. The planning staff recommends approval. (Tax Map 649, Block 02, Parcel 029A) The site is zoned I-2 which allows for this use.

Mr. Clay Shepherd, Senior Planner, Durham City/County Planning will present the case and answer questions.

County Manager's Recommendation: Recommend approval of the site plan submittal.

Mr. Clay Shepherd presented the Commissioners an overview of the site plan request.

Vice-Chairman Reckhow and Commissioner Heron asked questions about the project to which Mr. Derrick Coryea, owner of Coryea Properties LLC, 11308 Windwitty Court, Raleigh, responded.

Vice-Chairman Reckhow moved, seconded by Commissioner Bowser, to approve the site plan request for Page Pointe Convenience.

The motion carried unanimously.

(Tax Map number 649, Block 02, Parcel 029A; recorded in Ordinance Book _____, page _____.)

Adoption of Farmland/Open Space Preservation Ordinance

The Farmland Preservation Ordinance was considered by the Board at its November 2, 1998 Worksession. Subsequent to that meeting, County Manager David

Thompson and County Attorney Chuck Kitchen met with Wayne Cash, Chairman of the Farmland Preservation Board. The County Manager recommended that the acquisition of determinable conservation easements and repurchase of conservation easements be deleted from the proposed ordinance.

On March 19, 1999, the Farmland Preservation Board met and voted that the acquisition of determinable conservation easements and repurchase of conservation easements remain in the proposed ordinance. Also, the Farmland Preservation Board approved the guidelines for the Farmland Ranking System.

On April 7, 1999, this item was discussed at the monthly worksession, whereupon comments from that meeting have been incorporated into the current proposed ordinance.

County Manager's Recommendation: Discuss and approve the ordinance with the Farmland Ranking System.

County Manager David F. Thompson wanted to be sure the agenda cover memorandum was accurate. It is accurate in that the County Manager, at the previous meeting, recommended that the acquisition of determinable conservation easements and repurchase of conservation easements be deleted from the proposed ordinance. I went back to my notes at that Board meeting and the direction given at that point in time which the new proposed ordinance does contain. The directions were to eliminate the lease option, to look in the future at funding and financing, and to look in the future of transfer development rights. The Board left in the repurchase conservation easements section. I did not want you to be misled by the recommendation made prior to this ordinance. The repurchase agreement is in this new ordinance at the Board's direction.

Mr. Lowell Siler, Deputy County Attorney, reviewed for the Board members minor changes in the ordinance including the minor change in the ordinance name. The name was changed to Farmland/Open Space Preservation Ordinance.

Mr. Wayne E. Cash, 3706 Snow Hill Road, recognized the members in the audience present for this agenda item. He urged the members of the Commission to adopt the ordinance.

Mr. Howard Moore, Volunteer Farmland Protection Board member, 732 Mason Road, thanked the Commissioners for what they have done relative to the Farmland/Open Space Preservation Ordinance.

Chairman Black returned the matter back to the Board for disposition.

Vice-Chairman Reckhow moved, seconded by Commissioner Bowser, to adopt the Farmland/Open Space Preservation Ordinance.

The motion carried unanimously.

The ordinance follows:

**Durham County, North Carolina
Farmland/Open Space Protection Program Guidelines**

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction	<u>Page</u>
	A. General	1
	B. Duties and Responsibilities of the Durham Farmland Protection Board (hereafter referred to as the Board)	1
	C. Definition of Conservation Easements	2
	D. Definition of Agricultural Uses	2
	E. Definition of Open Space	2
II.	Agricultural Priority Areas (APA)	
	A. General	2
	B. Criteria for Designation	2-3
	C. Procedure for Designation and/or Termination	3
	D. Protection from Public Capital Projects	3
III.	Purchase of Conservation Easements	
	A. General	3
	B. Description	4
	C. Minimum Eligibility Criteria	4
	D. Application Procedure	4
	E. Review and Ranking of Applications	4
	F. Acquisition	4-5
	G. Public Disclosure	5
IV.	Donation of Conservation Easements	
	A. General	5
	B. Description	5-6
	C. Minimum Eligibility Criteria	6
	D. Application Procedure	6
	E. Review of Application	6
	F. Acquisition	6-7

G.	Public Disclosure	7
V.	Repurchase of Conservation Easements	
A.	General	7
B.	Repurchase Procedure	7-8
VI.	Property Use Restrictions	8-9
VII.	Farmland Ranking System	10-11

I. Introduction

A. General

The protection of Durham County's best agricultural land in a manner that directs and accommodates growth and development is a high priority to the residents of Durham County. To this end the county establishes the following goals:

1. To protect and conserve those soils in Durham County best suited to agricultural uses;
2. To identify and harmonize policies of government at all levels which may conflict with the goal of protection of farmland;
3. To reduce land use conflicts between agricultural and other land uses; and
4. To promote agriculture as an integral part of the Durham County economy. Non-traditional farms will also be promoted.

These program guidelines contain policies and procedures for administering a farmland protection program.

B. Duties and Responsibilities of the Durham Farmland Protection Advisory Board (hereinafter referred to as the Board)

The Farmland Protection Advisory Board as organized and empowered pursuant to the Durham County Voluntary Farmland Protection Ordinance shall administer this farmland protection program. The Board, with assistance from the County Attorney, shall act on behalf of the county in administering this Farmland

Protection Program. The Board shall select properties for purchasing Agricultural Conservation Easements, accepting donations of Agricultural Conservation Easements, developing, purchase and acquisition priorities, work with Durham County Commissioners on funding options, execute any and all documents necessary to administer the program, and perform any other such acts necessary for the implementation of this program. The Board shall administer this program within the financial resources provided by the Durham County Board of Commissioners and outside funding resources. The Board will make recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners regarding the purchase of conservation easements, and acceptance of donated conservation easements. The Board of County Commissioners will be the final decision-maker regarding the purchase of conservation easements, and accepting the donation of conservation easements.

C. Definition of Conservation Easements

For purposes of this program, conservation easements are defined as:

“All right, title, and interest in the use of land for any and all purposes which are not directly and customarily incidental to agricultural or open space uses.”

D. Definition of Agricultural Uses

For purposes of this program, agricultural uses are defined as:

“Agricultural uses include, but are not limited to, the production of crops, trees, horticultural specialties, livestock, and livestock products. Associated uses allowable are sales and processing necessary and customarily incidental to the agricultural activities on-site which are in keeping with the purpose of the program.”

E. Definition of Open Space

For purposes of this program, open space is defined as:

“Open space is land used for recreation, natural resource protection, amenities, and/or bufferyards. Open space may include, but is not limited to, lawns, walkways, active recreation areas, playgrounds, wooded areas, greenways, and water courses.”

II. Agricultural Priority Areas (APA)

A. The designation of Agricultural Priority Areas in Durham County is intended to identify geographic areas containing the most productive agricultural soils. Agricultural Priority Area designation is the first step in directing the expenditure of funds for conservation easements acquisition. Efforts to coordinate with the City/County Planning Department in regards to the Urban Growth Boundary and Priority Growth Area will be made.

B. Criteria for Designation

The following are guidelines for the designation of Agricultural Priority Areas:

1. Areas should contain sufficient contiguous agricultural land to facilitate its permanent agricultural use.
2. Areas should consist primarily of soils identified in Durham County as prime or locally important.
3. Land in the area should be primarily in agricultural use.

C. Procedure for Designation and/or Termination

Agricultural Priority Areas will be established by the Board. In determining areas to include, the Board may confer with any governing body affected by the proposed APA, receive recommendations from the City-County Planning Department, and/or conduct a public meeting to receive public comments. The Board will establish APAs by resolution and adopt an official map showing boundaries of all APAs. Termination of an APA shall be by resolution approved by the Board.

D. Protection from Public Capital Projects

Durham County will promote, to the extent possible, protection of continued agricultural use of land in APAs from incompatible capital projects that are not planned at the time of APA establishment and which would result in extensive, direct and/or indirect conversion of farmland resources. If possible, no project funded directly or indirectly by the Durham County Board of Commissioners will be conducted on land included in an APA if it would lead to the direct conversion of farmland.

III. Purchase of Conservation Easements

A. General

Durham County may purchase conservation easements in agricultural and/or open space lands. All applications for the purchase of conservation easements will be evaluated based upon the attached Farmland Ranking System. Highest priority will be given to farms located within an APA. There may be instances when purchasing Agricultural Conservation Easements on small farms outside of the APA may serve Durham citizens well. Applications will be ranked based upon various site factors, such as the level of development pressure and agricultural production capability. Conservation easements may be purchased in accordance with the ranking of farm properties and the availability of allocated funds. Compensation for conservation easements will be based on the Board's determination of the difference between fair market value and agricultural or open space value appraisals. The purchase price will be subject to negotiation.

B. Description

The purchase of conservation easements is legally binding, restricting the owner and future owners to agricultural and/or open space use of the land. The conservation easements will be held in public trust by Durham County.

C. Minimum Eligibility Criteria

The agricultural and/or open space land must be at least twenty (20) acres in size or contiguous to at least two (2) qualifying farms which will create a tract of not less than twenty (20) acres and be in agricultural and/or open space use.

D. Application Procedure

An application must be submitted to the Durham Farmland Protection Board through the Cooperative Extension Service, Durham Soil and Water Conservation District, or local USDA FSA Center.

E. Review and Ranking of Applications

The Board will review and rank each of the applications using the Farmland Ranking System.

F. Acquisition

1. The Board at its expense will obtain two appraisals on tracts considered for entry into the program. One appraisal will establish current fair market value of the property at its current highest and best use. The second appraisal will establish the value of the property for agricultural or open space use.
2. Upon receiving the written appraisals, the Board will present the values to the landowner by certified mail. The landowner will have thirty (30) days from receipt of the values to submit an offer to sell his/her conservation easements. Failure to respond in writing within the required time may constitute waiver of the opportunity, in the sole discretion of the Board. Upon receiving an offer to sell, a representative of the Board will meet with the landowners and attempt to negotiate a price with the landowner and recommend a purchase price to the Board of County Commissioners. If an agreement is reached, a contract to convey will be signed promptly by the landowner and the Board of County Commissioners.
3. The County Attorney or his designee will cause any necessary title examinations to be performed and all documentation to be prepared. If the property in question is subject to mortgage(s) or lien(s), a subordination agreement or waiver must be secured from the mortgage or lien holder. Closing will not take place until this requirement is met. The Board of County Commissioners, or their designee, will assist in securing this agreement with the mortgage or lien holder, at the request of the landowner.
4. Upon preparation of appropriate legal documents covering titles, deeds, surveys, and subordination agreements, the closing will be scheduled. Prior to closing, all legal documents will be reviewed by the County Attorney for verification and accuracy. At closing, the owner will execute appropriate full warranty documents conveying conservation easements to the county in perpetuity. After proper recordation of necessary instructions, the landowner

will be presented with a check. The county will bear all closing and related costs. The Board will securely store all pertinent records, including deeds.

5. The Board may extend any stated time limits as circumstances require. The deviations will be reported to the Chairman of the Board and the landowner.

G. Public Disclosure

During negotiations concerning the purchase of conservation easements, information will be kept confidential, as allowed by law. Following an agreement between the landowner and the Board of Commissioners, information may be made public as provided by law.

Following closing of each purchase, information may be made public as provided by law.

IV. Donation of Conservation Easements

A. General

The Board of County Commissioners may accept a voluntary donation or devise of conservation easements.

B. Description

The donation of conservation easements is legally binding, restricting the owner and future owners to agricultural and/or open space use of the land. The conservation easements will be held in public trust by Durham County in perpetuity.

C. Minimum Eligibility Criteria

The agricultural and/or open space land must be at least twenty (20) acres in size or contiguous to at least two (2) qualifying farms which will create a tract of not less than twenty (20) acres and be in agricultural and/or open space use.

D. Application Procedure

Guidance documents for donating conservation easements are housed at the Cooperative Extension Office. Upon contact by

landowner, a meeting will be set with the County Attorney to discuss donation of conservation easements.

E. Review of Applications

The Board will review the documentation to determine whether the minimum eligibility criteria are met or whether to waive any of the criteria.

F. Acquisition

1. The property owner shall be responsible for assessing the value of the conservation easement. If there is a need for an appraisal, the county will pay for it.
2. The County Attorney, or his designee, will cause any necessary title examinations to be performed and all documentation to be prepared. If the property in question is subject to mortgage(s) or lien(s), a subordination agreement or waiver must be secured from the mortgage or lien holder. Closing will not take place until this requirement is met.

The Board of County Commissioners will assist in securing this agreement with the mortgage or lien holder, at the request of the landowner.

3. Upon preparation of appropriate legal documents covering titles, deeds, surveys, and subordination agreements, the closing will be scheduled by the Board. Prior to closing, all legal documents will be reviewed by the County Attorney for verification and accuracy. At closing, the owner will execute appropriate full warranty documents conveying conservation easements to the county in perpetuity. After proper recordation of necessary instruments, the Chairman of the Board of County Commissioners or his designee will sign and present the Donation Verification Statement to the landowner. The county will bear all closing and related costs. The Board will securely store all pertinent records, including deeds.

G. Public Disclosure

During negotiations concerning the donation of conservation easements, information will be kept confidential, as allowed by law.

Following a donation agreement, information may be made public as provided by law.

V. **Repurchase of Conservation Easements**

A. General

The designation of Agricultural Priority Areas and the subsequent purchase of conservation easements is intended to create areas with sufficient amounts of contiguous agricultural and/or open space land to facilitate the permanent agricultural use and/or open space of the land. While program activity will be directed toward that goal, success is dependent on the voluntary participation of landowners.

If a landowner or several owners of small tracts are the only participants in their area, the goal may not be achieved. These landowners could become landlocked by development and agricultural activity and/or open space use may become impractical.

In such a situation it may be in the best interest of the landowner and the public to allow repurchase of the conservation easements for the property in question. Other circumstances could also affect a property's suitability for continued agricultural and/or open space use. Repurchase of conservation easements by a landowner is foreseen as an unusual and infrequent occurrence, and would take place with the concurrence of the Board and the Durham County Board of Commissioners.

B. Repurchase Procedure

A landowner requesting a review of his property for possible repurchase of conservation easements should do so by certified letter to the Farmland Protection Board. The letter should state the reason for the request and the date that the property was entered into the program.

Upon approval in principle to the repurchase, the landowner must submit two appraisals of value for the property in question. One appraisal will establish the fair market value of the property at its current highest and best use. The second appraisal will establish the value of the property for agricultural or open space use. Other appraisals will be secured as necessary.

The Board will review the appraised values and decide to either recommend a repurchase price to the Durham County Board of Commissioners or decline to recommend repurchase.

If a repurchase price is approved by the Board of Commissioners, the landowner will be notified. If the price is acceptable to the landowner, he/she will submit a written offer to purchase the conservation easements. If this offer is granted by the County, closing proceedings will begin. The County may accept the bid and advertise for upset bids.

The County Attorney, or his designee will secure all legal documents necessary for the closing and will bear all associated costs.

When legal documents are prepared and adequate financing is available, a date, time, and location for closing will be agreed upon. Payment shall be made directly to the county at closing by a certified check or equivalent payment.

VI. Property Use Restrictions

In addition to restrictions set out elsewhere in these guidelines, the following restrictions will apply to property included in the purchase, acquisition of determinable conservation easements, or donation of conservation easements program. A waiver of any restriction may be granted only upon approval by the Board in writing.

- A. Residences permitted on the land from which conservation easements have been conveyed are existing dwellings and the replacement of existing dwellings.

Request for additional dwellings shall be considered on a case-by-case basis. No more than three (3) dwellings will be permitted on the property included in the purchase, lease, or donation of conservation easements.

- B. All permitted non-agricultural structures shall, when feasible, be located in the immediate vicinity of existing structures, described as homestead or curtilage, as reasonable expansions of the homestead or curtilage or on the area(s) of the property of least productive capability. Such permitted structures shall, when feasible, utilize existing or common driveways, lanes or right of ways.
- C. The extraction of minerals by surface mining and extraction and removal of topsoil from the property are prohibited. The extraction of subsurface or deep-mined minerals, including natural gas and oil, and the non-commercial extraction of minerals including limestone, shale and other minerals shall be permitted, as long as the removal activity does not significantly diminish the agricultural potential of the land.
- D. Use of the property for dumping, storage, processing, or landfill of non-agricultural solid waste generated off-site is prohibited. Land application of biosolids is acceptable.
- E. Use of the property for dumping, storage, processing, or landfill of hazardous or nuclear waste is prohibited.
- F. Signs, billboard, and outdoor advertising structures may not be displayed on the property except to state the name of the property, the name and address of the occupant, to advertise an on-site activity and to advertise the property for sale or rent, allowed by the Durham County sign ordinance.
- G. Agricultural land will be managed in accordance with sound soil and water conservation practices in a manner which will not destroy or substantially or irretrievably diminish the productive capability of the property.
- H. County officials shall have the right to enforce these restrictions by injunction and all other appropriate proceedings allowable by law. Representatives of the county may enter upon the property for the purposes of inspection concerning compliance with the Farmland Protection Program.
- I. The county will hold the conservation easements in public trust for farmland protection and/or open space purposes and will not

voluntarily assign these rights except to another organization bound to hold such rights for the same purposes.

J. All tracts of land from which conservation easements were purchased with Federal or State funds will be subject to Federal and State regulations concerning farmland protection.

K. Timbering Operations

Clear cutting of timber is not allowed. A request to waive this restriction will be considered only if a valid management plan prepared by a registered forester or consulting forester, is submitted with the request.

Durham County Farmland/Open Space Protection Program Guidelines
Farmland Ranking System

1. Farm /Open Space Size (Weight - 100 points)

A score of one point per acre is given up to a maximum of 100 points.

2. Percentage of Farm/ Open Space in Agricultural Use (Weight - 100 Points)

A score of one ranking point per percentage point of land in production compared to total farm size is given up to a maximum of 100 points.

3. Proximity To Urban Growth Boundary

Farmland located outside Urban Growth Boundary	50	Points
Farmland located inside Urban Growth Boundary	0	Points

4. Proximity to Public Water and Sewer (Weight - 50 points)

No existing or planned service within one mile radius	50	Points
Existing or planned service within one mile radius	35	Points
Existing or planned service within ½ mile	30	Points
Planned service within 1/4 mile	25	Points
Existing service within 1/4 mile	15	Points
Existing service adjacent	5	Points

5. Proximity to Agricultural Priority Area (APA) (Weight 50 - 300 points)
- | | |
|-------------------------------|------------|
| Included in APA | 300 Points |
| Within 1/4 of APA | 200 Points |
| Within 1/4 to 1/2 mile of APA | 100 Points |
| More than 1/2 mile from APA | 50 Points |
6. Capital Investment in Farm Operation (Weight- 300 points) (Dwellings are not included in this determination other than employee housing.)
- | | |
|---|------------|
| Substantial capital investment in last 5 years | 300 Points |
| Substantial capital investment in last 10 year | 200 Points |
| Substantial capital investment in last 15 years | 100 Points |
7. Conservation Program (weight - 200 points)
- | | |
|---|------------|
| Soil Conservation BMPs in place on 75-100 percent of cropland | 200 Points |
| Soil Conservation BMPs in place on 50-75 percent cropland | 100 Points |
8. Historic, Scenic, Environmental Qualities (Weight - 50 points)
- | | |
|--|-----------|
| Exceptional features favorable to protection (National Register of Historic Places, exceptional scenic contribution on major highway corridor, adjacent to site included in the Natural Areas Registry of the N.C. Natural Heritage Program) | 50 Points |
| Significant features favorable to protection (Historic Site Survey, scenic contribution on rural roads, adjacent to any sites included in the Durham County Inventory of Natural Areas and Rare Species) | 40 Points |
| Features favorable to protection (Significant but Undocumented historic features, moderate localized scenic contribution adjacent to publicly owned lands). | 30 Points |

(Ordinance recorded in Ordinance Book _____, page _____.)

Presentation on the Family Court Proposal

Based on the Board's directions, staff contracted with the Freelon Group to develop programming and schematic designs for a unified family court system in the Wachovia Bank Building (located at 2000 West Main Street). The concept of a family court is a

comprehensive court with jurisdiction over all family-related legal matters. A single judge or court team tracks and decides all of a family's legal issues until they are resolved. Family court consists of Juvenile Services, Guardian Ad Litem, juvenile court, domestic court, Child Support Courts, Child Support Enforcement, and miscellaneous support functions.

To accommodate the program requirements of family court, the Wachovia Bank Building will require major renovations. Therefore, staff will present four options to the Board to address office and courtroom space needs. Each option has different cost estimates.

1. Lease the entire building and locate a unified family court system in the facility.
2. Purchase the building and locate a unified family court system in the facility.
3. Lease two (2) floors of the building and locate Juvenile Services, juvenile court, and domestic court in the facility.
4. Lease space in downtown to locate court-related office functions, such as Public Defender and Juvenile Services, and renovate the abandoned space in the Judicial Building for courtroom space.

Resource Persons for this item are Ken Titus, District Court Judge; Kathy Shuart, Trial Court Administrator; and David Powell, Economic Development/Real Estate.

County Manager's Recommendation: Note that the staff is presenting various options for the establishment of the family court operations. Staff is seeking Board direction prior to putting together the final solution for approval during the month of August. The program document completed by The Freelon Group Inc. is enclosed for your review prior to this session.

David Powell, Economic Development/Real Estate, presented the Commissioners an introduction to the family court proposal. The Board authorized staff to employ an architectural firm to investigate the feasibility of renovating the Wachovia Building for family court. The family court proposal came about after discussion concerning the court system space needs.

The Freelon Group Inc. will discuss the family court proposal which are options one and two.

David Powell is going to discuss options three and four.

Chief District Court Judge Kenneth Titus will discuss the operational impact of each option.

After Judge Titus' remarks, the Commissioners will discuss the proposals and give staff directions.

Representatives from the Freelon Group Inc. began their presentation on options one and two relative to floor plans and cost figures.

David Powell continued the presentation by reviewing the spreadsheet with all four options for the Commissioners' information.

The Commissioners asked several questions for staff and architects' responses.

Judge Titus presented the operational impact of each option. His presentation included history of the building uses since it was built. He also talked about the increased workload over the years.

The Commissioners asked Judge Titus several questions about the court system.

Chairman Black asked County Manager Thompson to work on option four for us and also bring back option three. Look at option three and option four but work through option four looking at First Union Bank. This item should be brought back to the Board in August.

Commissioner Bowser wanted the staff to revisit the seventh floor jail space in the Judicial Building to see if office space could be built there.

No official action was taken on this agenda item.

Lease Agreement for Board of Elections

The Board of Elections (BOE) currently occupies approximately 3,000 square feet in the Old County Courthouse and approximately 600 square feet in the Carmichael Building. The County Attorney's Office has communicated to the County Manager the need for additional space due to increasing responsibilities and staff. To accommodate the County Attorney's space needs, the BOE will need to relocate into leased space.

Several space options were investigated in the downtown area for the BOE. Staff recommends leasing 4,134 square feet at City Place (706 West Corporation Street). The lease rate is \$10.00 per square foot for the first year and increases .03 percent per year over the term of the five-year lease agreement. The landlord will provide all services, maintenance, repairs, utilities, and at least 18 parking spaces for the exclusive use of the BOE. The landlord will also perform all renovations and alterations to the space according to the County's needs and specifications with the exception of computer networking. Sufficient funds were set aside in PAYG for rent (\$34,450) and computer networking (\$6,060).

Locating the BOE in a freestanding building coincides with recommendations being developed in the Facility Master Plan. Ideally, the BOE should be located in a facility

accessible to public parking with curbside capabilities for absentee voting. The BOE also has limited interaction with other County agencies and thus does not need to be located in the same facility.

Resource persons are David Powell, Economic Development/Real Estate; Carol Booth, Board of Elections; and Chuck Kitchen, County Attorney.

County Manager's Recommendation: Provide the County Manager with the authority to enter into a lease agreement with the landlord of City Place based on the terms and conditions of the agreement.

David Powell presented the Commissioners a summary of the proposal including the corrections just stated.

Commissioner Bowser expressed concern about the number of parking spaces available at the building.

The Commissioners asked several questions about the lease proposal to which David Powell responded.

Commissioner Bell said an agreement is not in the lease that we can terminate the lease early. The clause should be there.

Mr. Powell stated the landlord is paying for the upfit. He would not agree to an early termination clause.

County Attorney Chuck Kitchen suggested that if you are satisfied with the basic term, let us rework the lease to address these issues.

Commissioner Heron moved, seconded by Commissioner Bell, to approve the lease contingent upon the County Attorney making those changes in the lease that were discussed.

The motion carried with the following vote:

Ayes: Bell, Black, Heron, and Reckhow
Noes: Bowser

Lebanon Township Plan Presentation

The Planning Department periodically produces Small Area plans; Durham is subdivided into 15 Small Areas and Downtown. The Lebanon Township Plan is the 12th such plan done. The Lebanon Township Plan planning process involves citizen and staff input; the

Plan is the result of input from four community meetings and staff research. The Lebanon Plan contains a summary of existing conditions and a set of policies to guide future growth in the Township, and champions concepts outlined in the Durham 2020 Comprehensive Plan. While maintaining the area's rural and suburban character, the Plan proposes several limited areas of more intensive development in an Urban or Regional Corridor. Any new development must be sensitive to environmental and compatibility concerns. The Lebanon Township Plan is generally compatible with and supportive of adopted plans. The Planning Committee of the Durham Planning Commission recommended adoption of the draft Plan at its meeting on May 12, 1999. Planning staff recommends adoption of the Lebanon Township Plan with minor text changes, which are listed in the attached memo "Clarifying Language for Two Implementation Measures in the Draft Lebanon Township Plan."

T.E. Austin, Durham City/County Planning Department, will present this item.

County Manager's Recommendation: Staff is requesting that the County Commissioners receive this presentation and give direction to staff as to any revisions. It would then be appropriate to either approve this plan or have it brought back to a future regular session for approval.

After discussion, the Commissioners decided to move this agenda item to a future meeting and schedule it as a public hearing. The City/County Planning Committee will discuss the Lebanon Township Plan at its next meeting.

Durham Community Shelter for HOPE—Funding Advance

At the June 28, 1999 BOCC (Budget Adoption) meeting, the Board stipulated that the Durham Community Shelter for Hope receive \$150,000 for FY '99-'00. The Board further instructed that these funds were to be disbursed 1/12 per month (\$12,500/mo).

Mr. Hap Johnson, Chairman of the Shelter's Board, will present to the Board of County Commissioners an analysis of the Shelter's current cash flow status and request a \$40,682 advance on '99-'00 funding to sustain the Shelter through August 4, 1999 (the date of the next Board of County Commissioners' worksession). At that time shelter management, assisted by County staff, will present to the Board a plan of action for financing its operations for the remainder of FY '99-'00.

County Manager's Recommendation: Advance the Shelter \$40,682 to sustain its operations through August 4 with the condition that it commit to present at that time an acceptable plan of action that 1) establishes a plan for financing the remainder of FY '99-'00, and 2) addresses any concerns raised by the County's Internal Audit and/or Budget staff.

Chairman Black said the Shelter's Board is requesting a cash advance of \$40,682.

County Manager David F. Thompson introduced the agenda item since he had met with some members of the shelter's board. Mr. Thompson requested from this Board a cash flow projection through August 4, 1999. He also said that a member of the County's budget staff prepared a cash flow statement for this entire fiscal year.

On August 4, 1999, County Manager Thompson and the shelter's board will bring a corrective action plan to the Commissioners.

Mr. Hap Johnson will talk about the current shortfall in the amount of \$40,682 at this meeting and the need for the County to advance its appropriation.

Mr. Thompson said that at this time he was not recommending that the Commissioners increase their appropriation but advance it.

Mr. Johnson reviewed the cash flow statement for the Commissioners.

The Commissioners asked Mr. Johnson several questions about the financial situation at the shelter to which Mr. Thompson and Mr. Johnson responded.

Extension of Meeting

Commissioner Heron moved, seconded by Vice-Chairman Reckhow, to extend the meeting until 11:15 p.m.

The motion carried unanimously.

Durham Community Shelter for HOPE--Funding Advance (continued)

Vice-Chairman Reckhow moved, seconded by Commissioner Heron, to approve an advance payment now in the amount of \$29,682 to the Durham Community Shelter for HOPE.

The motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Black said the County Manager will come to the Commissioners in August with a corrective action plan for the shelter.

Salary Increases

Chairman Black said the Board of County Commissioners, at the July 12, 1999 Regular Session, took official action to give salary increases to the following County officials:

NAME	SALARY		DIFFERENCE	PERCENT
	'98-'99	'99-'00		
Worth Hill	\$ 73,000	\$ 76,650	\$ 3,650	5 %
Willie S. Covington	67,500	70,875	3,375	5 %
Charles Clark	73,000	78,110	5,110	7 %
*David F. Thompson	116,000	124,120	8,120	7 %
Chuck Kitchen	97,000	103,790	6,790	7 %

*Travel allowance is \$500 per month.

The increases were retroactive to July 1, 1999.

Vice-Chairman Reckhow moved, seconded by Commissioner Bell, to approve the salaries as presented by the chairman.

Commissioner Bowser said all the department heads have done a commendable job and I commend them for that. I was very adamant about the fact that employees should receive their due raises in a given year. The employees will get a 2.5% to 5% raise. I am one who feels that what is good for the goose is good for the gander also. Therefore, I do not support any department head receiving a raise beyond 5%. Another reason I do not support the 7% raises is if you have an employee making \$20,000 a year and another is making \$120,000, the money will be worth 5 times more than the employee making \$20,000. Our County officials have done a great job and I support them, but I will not support their raise percentage to be any higher than the percentage that the employees get.

Chairman Black, Vice-Chairman Reckhow, and Commissions Bell and Heron made remarks about the salary adjustments relative to the reasons that they supported the salary increases.

Extension of Meeting

Commissioner Heron moved, seconded by Vice-Chairman Reckhow, to extend the meeting until 11:30 p.m.

The motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Bowser commented that if the Commissioners had not voted on a pay plan that did not specifically state that the employees pay raises would run between 2.5% and 5%, I would have supported you. I want to remind you that you voted on that and you did not vote on one for the top people. I want you to know I want a level playing field.

The following votes were taken on the individual salary increases:

- a) County Manager David F. Thompson \$124,120
 Travel Allowance \$ 500 per month

Ayes: Bell, Black, Heron, and Reckhow
Noes: Bowser

- b) County Attorney Chuck Kitchen \$103,790

Ayes: Bell, Black, Heron, and Reckhow
Noes: Bowser

- c) Tax Administrator Charles Clark \$ 78,110

Ayes: Bell, Black, Bowser, Heron, and Reckhow
Noes: None

- d) Sheriff Worth Hill \$ 76,650

Ayes: Bell, Black, Heron, and Reckhow
Noes: Bowser

- e) Register of Deeds Willie Covington \$ 70,875

Ayes: Bell, Black, Heron, and Reckhow
Noes: Bowser

County Manager David F. Thompson thanked the Commissioners and he stated it has been an enjoyable year and he thanked them for their support. It was a good budget year and you have treated the employees fairly. It has been a pleasure working with all five Board members.

Board and Commission Appointments

The following votes were cast to make appointments to the following boards and commissions (asterisks designates appointees):

Alcoholic Beverage Control Board

One expired term (expires July 31, 2002).

*Mary Ellen Williams—Bell, Black, Bowser, Heron, and Reckhow

Area Mental Health Board

One position for a family consumer representing the interests of individuals with developmental disabilities and one at-large position (terms expire July 30, 2003).

*Terry McCabe—Bell, Black, Bowser, Heron, and Reckhow

Civic Center Authority

One expired term (expires July 31, 2002).

*Jimmy L. Gibbs—Bell, Black, Bowser, Heron, and Reckhow

Convention and Visitors Bureau

One expired term for the County at-large position (term expires July 31, 2002).

Johnathan S. Madren—no votes

*Thomas N. Niemann—Bell, Black, Bowser, Heron, and Reckhow

Jury Commission

One expired term (expires July 2001).

*Patricia A. Carrington—Bell, Black, Bowser, Heron, and Reckhow

Library Board of Trustees

Three expired terms (all terms expire July 31, 2002).

C. Douglas Beckham—no votes

Willa Coward Bryant—Bell

*Bessie M. Carrington—Bell, Black, Bowser, Heron, and Reckhow

Barbara J. Carney—Bowser

*Robert L. Chapman—Black, Heron, and Reckhow

*Robert K. Otterbourg—Bell, Black, Bowser, Heron, and Reckhow

Stephen Perlman—no votes

Dr. Alexander Spock—no votes

Robert Stevens—no votes

Social Services Board

One expired term (three-year term expires July 31, 2002).

*Cheryl E. Amana—Bell, Black, Bowser, Heron, and Reckhow

Dr. Michael O. Royster—no votes

Adjournment

Chairman Black adjourned the meeting at 11:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Garry E. Umstead, CMC
Clerk to the Board