

MINUTES
CHATHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
REGULAR MEETING
JUNE 06, 2011

The Board of Commissioners (“the Board”) of the County of Chatham, North Carolina, met in the Agricultural Building Auditorium, 45 South Street, in Pittsboro, North Carolina, at 6:00 PM on June 06, 2011.

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

Staff 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

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Commissioner Petty delivered the invocation after which Chairman Bock invited everyone present to stand and recite the Pledge of Allegiance.

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Bock welcomed those in attendance and called the meeting to order at 6:07 PM.

AGENDA AND CONSENT AGENDA

The Chairman asked if there were additions, deletions, or corrections to the Agenda and Consent Agenda.

Chairman Bock asked that the May 16, 2011 Regular Minutes be removed from the Consent Agenda and placed on the Regular Agenda after the Public Input Session.

Commissioner Petty asked that, due to the number of people signed up to speak, the Public Input Session be extended for thirty minutes at the end of the meeting.

Commissioner Petty moved, seconded by Commissioner Cross, to approve the Agenda and Consent Agenda with the noted requests.

1. **Minutes:** Approval of Board Minutes for the ~~Regular Meeting held on May 16, 2011~~ and Budget Public Hearings held May 23, 2011 and May 24, 2011

The May 16, 2011 Regular Meeting Minutes were removed from the Consent Agenda and placed on the Regular Agenda for discussion.

The motion carried five (5) to zero (0).

2. **Debt Write-Off for Utilities Department:** Approval of debt write-off for the utilities department in the amount of \$13,154.41, attached hereto and by reference made a part hereof.

The motion carried five (5) to zero (0).

3. **Project Ordinance for Briar Chapel Park Improvements:** Approval of Project Ordinance for Briar Chapel Park Improvements, attached hereto and by reference made a part hereof.

The motion carried five (5) to zero (0).

4. **Criminal Records Check Policy:** Approval of a request to adopt the Criminal Records Check Policy, attached hereto and by reference made a part hereof.

The motion carried five (5) to zero (0).

5. **Fiscal Year 2010-2011 Budget Amendments:** Approval of fiscal year 2010-2011 budget amendments as proposed by staff, attached hereto and by reference made a part hereof.

The motion carried five (5) to zero (0).

6. **Annexation Reform Resolution:** Approval of **Resolution #2011-31 of the Chatham County Board of Commissioners Supporting House Bill 845 on Annexation Reform**, attached hereto and by reference made a part hereof.

The motion carried five (5) to zero (0).

END OF CONSENT AGENDA

COMMISSIONERS' PRIORITIES

Employee of the Year: Presentation of the Employee of the Year

Carolyn Miller, Human Resources Director, explained that this is the third year that the Employee of the Year has been awarded. She stated that the Personnel Committee, made up of different departments, is responsible for selecting an employee(s) of the month and from those who are selected as employee of the month, the employee of the year is selected. The committee met in May to select the employee of the year. The Fiscal Year 2010-2011 Employee of the Year is Hope Tally of the Finance Office. Hope has been with Chatham County for nearly ten years.

Ms. Miller provided an excerpt from Ms. Tally's nomination form as follows:

Reason for Nomination: This year, and actually the past two years, Hope has been a great help to me during budget time. She has done this with a great attitude and not with an attitude of "let's get this over with."

In what way does this employee demonstrate Employee of the Month criteria?

Hope has a great attitude not only toward her job and job duties, but toward her co-workers as well. She has always been willing to help no matter how small or big the request has been. She has taken the time to research or tell me how to get the information that I am looking for. I know that there are times she is very busy but has been willing to stop and help me with the task that I am doing. I believe that Hope is committed to not only achieving high standards for the Finance Department, but for everyone associated with Chatham County.

Chairman Bock congratulated Ms. Tally.

Ms. Tally stated this was truly an honor, noting she could not do her job without the wonderful co-workers she worked with, and in her mind this award was just as much for them as it was for her.

PUBLIC INPUT SESSION

Commissioner Stewart stated that she took extensive notes during these sessions, and many times when citizens were speaking or providing information they may make a statement based on factual information. She asked that when making such factual statements that the speakers cite their source so that the information could be corroborated. Commissioner Stewart stated as an example, someone might say that Chatham County was the third highest in per student spending, and she was asking that the speaker cite where that information came from so that the Board could look it up and read more about it if they felt the need.

Jennifer Lorenz, 673 Redgate Road, Pittsboro, NC, stated she wanted to share with the Board her profound respect for the Constitution of the United States. She felt certain that all members of the Board were familiar with the Constitution and was aware that offering sectarian prayers in the name of Jesus Christ every single Board meeting was in direct violation of the establishment clause of the First Amendment to the Constitution. For that reason, she asked that the Board embrace the diversity of faiths and beliefs in the County and cease the sectarian prayers in the name of only one faith.

Ms. Lorenz stated she also wanted to address further possible violations of the Fourth Amendment under Reasonable Search and Seizure and the Fifth Amendment under Due Process that resulted when local law enforcement officers were asked to perform federal enforcement duties for which they were not properly trained. She would be interested to know what Sheriff Webster thought of his officers performing the duties of the federal agency of Immigration and Customs Enforcement. This County comprised a highly diverse population and it would be in everyone's interest if battered women, witnesses to crimes, and citizens simply going about their daily routines, whether they were legal citizens or not, did not have to fear the Police. Such a person may be a legal citizen but feared that speaking to the Police would endanger friends or loved ones. She urged the Board to vote to maintain the constitutional resolution passed by the previous Board of Commissioners on January 5, 2009, adding that all of her references could be found in the U.S. Constitution.

Heather Johnson, 449 Foster Lane, Pittsboro, NC, presented her comments to the Board and provided them in their entirety for the record as follows:

“Thank you for the opportunity to address the Board today. I want to thank you and let you know how much you are supported for the great actions that you have been taking the last six months. A lot of us are dressed in red today absolutely in solidarity for your expediency to carrying out the responsibilities of our government and getting Chatham moving again. I want to speak to the issue of citizen input. In recent decisions made by our Board of Commissioners, there have been multiple opportunities for citizen input; in fact, some would say more opportunities than there ever have been. Thanks to our Board of Commissioners who are hearing all citizens, and even when you are not in agreement, thank you for respecting citizens' positions. Thank you for always treating your fellow commissioners with dignity and respect, even though you don't always agree.

For years, we as citizens have been attending these meetings. It was common place for our Commissioners, who work for us, that when they are taking comments by people with opposing views, we would encounter argumentative Commissioners. Commissioners that became defensive and interrupted our comments and statements and made us feel small. We don't hear this behavior by the body that we have now and I want to thank you for that. You also listen quietly. You thank those who come to speak to you. After all, you work for us. In recent days, we have witnessed Commissioner Sally Kost yell at and demean her fellow Commissioners. It is very unprofessional and disrespectful. I was yelled at in the hallway after a recent meeting. I am a citizen. I don't deserve to be intimidated. I am a citizen that deserves to be part of this process just like anybody else here.

All of the calls in the last week that citizens have not had the opportunity to participate have been false and have been encouraged by Mrs. Kost. There have been two public hearings on the budget. The budget has been on-line. We had a well-attended retreat in February. In intimidating citizens, it is absolutely not encouraging citizen input. There is one commissioner that I have seen that from and that is Commissioner Kost. Additionally, Mrs. Kost, your Facebook page includes references by you and your supporters to get pitchforks against our fellow Commissioners. While you say this is an innocent term, I would say that if it were Republicans or any of my fellow Tea Party Patriots, you would call us extremists out for violence. I am asking you to call for calm from your supporters.”

Iana Dubester, 97 Box Turtle Road, Pittsboro, NC, stated she respected a diversity of opinions and a diversity of population in the County, noting she grew up in Brazil under a military dictatorship. She immigrated to the United States 22 years ago and in 1996 became a U.S. citizen while living in Chatham County. That was the first time she had ever voted and she had not missed an election since.

Ms. Dubester stated today was a sad day for those who cared about justice and fairness for all of Chatham's residents. Today was also a sad day for those of them that cared about protecting the natural systems that their lives depended on, which were their air, their water, and their earth. It had become evident to her that no matter what they said, this Board's slim majority was intent on carrying out a public policy that was guided by rhetoric and fear instead of the needs and realities of their community. She stood here today as a witness to this Board's misguided actions, both in the undoing of the good works and vision of their past leaders that wished to create a welcoming and safe community for all Chatham residents, and in the dismantling of citizens' ability to guide and protect themselves and future generations from the excesses of development and all the forces that wished to pollute without restraint or accountability.

Ms. Dubester stated she wanted to end her comments with her favorite proverb which was an African proverb: "If you wish to go fast, go alone. If you wish to go far, go together." She said she hoped and wished that the Commissioners would choose to go far and not leave anyone behind, because you never knew who would save your life tomorrow.

Jeffrey Starkweather, 590 Old Goldston Road, Pittsboro, NC, presented his comments to the Board and provided them in their entirety for the record as follows:

"This past Friday's dismal jobs creation report reinforced my view that we have a current jobs crisis, not a budgetary crisis, here in Chatham.

More importantly, Chatham has a serious, long-term structural job crisis that it needs to address with economic development investments in infrastructure, education, and environment protection, among others. We have lost thousands of declining legacy industry jobs in the last decade. The average wage for a Chatham worker was \$173 a week below in the state average in 2009. By June 30, 2010, those wages in Siler City had declined by \$46 more dollars per week. See <http://www.bls.gov/ro4/qcewnc.pdf>

The connection between this jobs crisis and our county budget was made clear by news articles on May 25 in the Raleigh News and Observer and the Charlotte Business Journal, summarizing the most recent annual report from the North Carolina Commissioner on Workforce Development. See <http://www.bizjournals.com/charlotte/news/2011/05/25/nc-workers-need-to-adapt-to.html> and <http://www.newsobserver.com/2011/05/26/1226274/no-degree-no-job-thats-the-grim.html>.

I paid particular attention to this as a member of the Triangle South Workforce Development Board, as well as a member of the Chatham County Economic Development Board.

'The recession has accelerated trends already well under way in this state, giving an overwhelming employment edge to educated workers in a technology-based economy,' The Raleigh News and Observer stated in its summary. The report "... painted a dire picture for the legions of middle-class workers who for much of the 20th century formed the state's economic backbone"... and it "warned that the traditional job that required no more than a basic high school education is fast disappearing in this state. Displaced workers who are not retrained will end up in low-wage jobs, if they can find employment at all.'

'Because an emerging knowledge-based economy uses skilled talent to create a competitive advantage, emerging growth industries rely on workers who can demonstrate innovation and unique capabilities. These characteristics often derive from combining knowledge with creative instincts. For many low-skilled, dislocated workers, these skills may be beyond their reach without a significant investment of time and resources in education and training, "The Charlotte Business Journal's article on this report concludes.

The key finding of this report directly addressing the issue education as a critical investment for local job growth, as follows: "**Seeking good-paying jobs, more workers must increase their skills by accessing and completing education beyond high school or by earning industry-recognized credentials.** At least 42 percent, perhaps many more, of the new jobs being created in North Carolina will require **at minimum** some post-secondary education, many in Science, Technology, Engineering and Math—STEM—disciplines. This may represent an underestimate because businesses are increasingly opting to replace lower-skilled workers

(lost through attrition and layoffs) with more highly educated or trained employees. An even higher share of new, higher-wage jobs will require STEM-related skills, and many of those jobs will require post-secondary education or industry-recognized credentials. In particular, STEM jobs will constitute an increasing share of higher and medium-wage jobs, creating significant barriers to employment for unprepared young adults and existing workers.’

Access the report at: <http://www.nccommerce.com/workforce/about-us/plans-policies-reports-initiatives/reports/2011-state-of-the-workforce-report>.

Moreover, a study from the non partisan and non ideological Brookings Institute, entitled “Investing in the Future: An economic strategy for state or local governments in a period of tight budgets” provides as its principle recommendation: “Prioritize investments for the future. Investment should be prioritized and protected in government budgets. Infrastructure, education, health care, and environmental quality are critical to rising labor productivity, economic growth, and improved living standards. Cutting back on these critical fronts may help states balance their annual budget in the near term, but they threaten long-term prosperity.”

See *Investing in the Future: An economic strategy for state or local governments in a period of tight budgets*, February 2011, at http://www.brookings.edu/~media/Files/rc/papers/2011/02_state_budgets_greenstone_looney/02_state_budgets_greenstone_looney.pdf

Supporters of current board majority testified that the county was in excellent financial shape but that we needed save money now in case there is an “emergency in the future” or for when we have something better to spend it on. They seemed to have forgotten that back in December they said the top priority was jobs, jobs, jobs.

I am unaware of a theory of local economic development where reducing or eliminating investments in local schools, recreation, environment protection, libraries, etc. will help attract or create local high paying jobs now or in the future. If the current board believes they are relying on such a theory, I would ask that they inform the taxpayers and residents of Chatham about how it will work.

In my view, this “disinvestment strategy” to some extent repudiates the investment vision of the Chatham County Economic Development Strategic Plan, which states: “Chatham County’s strategic location between the Triad and Research Triangle regions positions it as the preferred location for emerging-growth companies.” (Emphasis added) As stated in both Workforce Development Commission and Brookings reports, the type of investments your budget cuts are exactly the type of investments that are needed to implement our current economic development vision for attracting high paying jobs with “emerging growth companies” to Chatham County.”

Randy Dye, 173 Olde Farm Road, Pittsboro, NC, presented his comments to the Board and provided them in their entirety for the record as follows:

“I’ve have had my ear to the ground recently, being focused on lobbying the Raleigh legislature before crossover on June 9th that I’ve left my rear in the air as a target and neglected to catch how the progressive groups are attempting to intimidate the commissioners with large numbers and drowning out common sense.

I’ve been receiving several reports of special interests groups coming into these meetings, pressuring our Board of Commissioners, attempting to make it appear you are not doing the will of your constituents.

I come here this evening to assure you this is not the case, in fact it's the furthest from the truth. I'll remind everyone that is why the former Board of Commissioners were voted out of office last election, not just 1 or 2, but all 3 were voted out of office.

I can honestly testify that from speaking with many members of the community that they were not happy with the previous Board of Commissioners and they are very satisfied with the decisions you have made since the election.

And now we have a call for political attacks against the new board of Commissioners being distributed via email and Facebook, twitter, etc asking special interest groups to come here and speak out against the BOC at these meetings, which they have every right to do.

But I will also remind you that these are just special interests groups, a very minute part of the population of Chatham County. A lot of this noise is coming from groups that want to have more power; power to police local farming, power to control water and building, power to control our children's education, and more ability to keep an ever watchful eye on citizens. They support more regulations that we the consumer end up paying for. These special interest groups are more interested in building their empires and having more power over the people than they are in working for common sense solutions.

I urge you to hear what they say but also hear the humble voices of the majority of the citizens in Chatham County and make your decisions accordingly.”

Donna Kelly, 553 Holly Glenn Road, Pittsboro, NC, presented her comments to the Board and provided them in their entirety for the record as follows:

“I want to express my support for the work the BOC has been doing this year. I’ve been following the BOC closely for the last two years with a lot of time spent reading minutes and reports going back many years beyond that. I started following the board because I was concerned about some of their decisions. I feel much more confident with the direction the new board majority is taking Chatham County than what I’ve seen in the past. I appreciate the extra attention to results rather than appearance.

I realize that it may appear there are more opponents of the new board than supporters by the attendance at these meetings. However, we must remember that there are many ways to contact commissioners outside of public input sessions. The majority of people in this county are busy taking care of their families rather than trying to push their agenda on the rest of the county. They believe that they are ultimately responsible for their lives, not the government, so they don’t feel the need to continually appeal to the government on every issue.

Apparently the opponents of the current policy changes feel the need to intimidate by creating a spectacle at public meetings or feel that the only voices that matter are those that show up at public hearings because they are appalled by recent actions. The opponents of the last board were appalled as well by the actions they saw. Instead of making threats and creating a scene we went to the polls and elected new commissioners. Instead of following their every move, most of these people went back to living their own lives and trusting their representatives to do their jobs based on the principles they expressed during the campaign.

No one is proposing to trash the environment or round up illegal immigrants for deportation in Chatham County. Just because someone doesn’t agree with your approach doesn’t mean they don’t want to reach similar goals. It’s time to stop with the misinformation and inflammatory rhetoric and be willing to consider some new ideas and approaches to the way we do things.

Peter Theye, 1065 Boothe Hill Road, Chapel Hill, NC, presented his comments to the Board and provided them in their entirety for the record as follows:

“Good Evening, Thank you for opportunity to speak tonight. I guess I should not be surprised how this board approved the budget last week. I am just very disappointed. By cutting short the work sessions, this board eliminated the opportunity for more public input. You know, you might have learned something. This action along with comments like the one Brian made at May 2nd BOC meeting about the uselessness of resolutions by this board to the State is disturbing.

I attended most of the BOC meetings when Bunkey Morgan was a member. When I walked into the room today, I could feel that same helplessness flow through me that I felt back then....I remember Bunkey asking a developer what conditions he would like to have on a specific Conditional Use Permit? Seemed inappropriate to me, and not unlike hearing that at a recent BOC meeting, Brian had asked members of the Home Builders Association what County rules and regulation trouble them?

Walter, I think you and I are about the same age...it is a strange feeling to think just how old that is. The thoughts I have today are very different from the ones I was having when I was in my forties. Priorities change, understanding about how precious and precarious all we have is, becomes very clear. It is my perception that Brian is running this board and I believe the 3-2 voting will continue, as it did with Utts, Emmerson, and Morgan unless you Walter, or you Ms. Stewart realize the price our wonderful County is paying for shortsighted, selfish goals is not worth it. I would hope that the deep roots your families have in this County and your maturity would help you see that the environmental and fiscal policies that Brian brings to the table are in conflict with what you truly hold most dear.”

Keith Horil, 1620 New Hope Church Road, Apex, NC, stated that he supported the Board in its recent budgetary decisions, and requested that they support simplified government and focus on providing the most essential services and infrastructure. He requested that the Board support fiscal conservativeness and to not spend what they did not have, and to have a greater respect for other peoples’ money than their own. He requested that the Board support reasonable use of County resources to assist in enforcement of all local, State, and federal laws.

Esta Cohen, 688 Van Thomas Road, Pittsboro, NC, presented her comments to the Board and provided them in their entirety for the record as follows:

“Though I am speaking as just one person, I know that I am expressing the concerns of many others. There is an awful lot of anger in the county concerning the *manner* in which the board is bringing about the changes they want for our community.

When the judicial center architect needed to make some decisions, he was told to go ahead and make changes without consideration of the LEEDS Certification requirements that were on the books.

LEEDS... was... going... away. Even though the requirements were still in place, even though there had been no public vote, somehow the Chair knew that continuation of the LEEDS program was *not* going to happen. At least one of the Commissioners was as surprised as were the rest of us. The majority had effectively disenfranchised her entire district.

It is not right that I find out at an Orange County Chamber of Commerce breakfast that the Environmental Impact Assessments for subdivisions are to be drastically altered, essentially made non-existent.

I quote from Commissioner Bock’s presentation at that breakfast: “It still has to go through public hearing, but the majority of the board has agreed.” How can you be in agreement over something that has not yet been publicly discussed?

I should not find out from a home builders newsletter that the board is removing the ERB from the approval process of Chatham County subdivisions. It states on page 7 of the March/April Edition of *Rooflines*, the newsletter of the Home Builders Assoc of Durham, Orange and Chatham Counties, and I quote: ‘Chatham County recently began the process of making several changes to the County’s Subdivision ordinance. Specifically, they removed the Environmental Review Board (ERB) from the approval process.’ The write-up on Chatham continues on for another 2 paragraphs.

How is it possible, that the editor of Rooflines knew so much about the future decisions of my county commissioners? And, knew it way back in February? How is it possible that an announcement of a major ordinance change is made *before* the legally required public hearing? How can the chair be so very confident of a majority vote, that the results could be stated four months before any public discussion took place? Before any vote took place?

Behind the scenes decision-making, quiet agreements outside the public process, has a lot of names. None of them very nice, and all of them, beneath the dignity of a board serving this County. To bring us back to a time when a wink and a nod was considered governing, is regrettable.”

Chairman Bock stated that the last speaker had talked about agreements before they were voted on. He stated the Board was talking about the streamlining of the planning process in a public meeting, and presentations were made by the Planning Director. Chairman Bock stated

the Board was provided with various choices and voted on by the Board. He stated it was all done in public and was all on the record, and it was in fact voted on but the ordinance has not yet been changed to that effect.

Rich Steele, 145 Julia Lane, Pittsboro, NC, stated he was present to support the County's three new Commissioners. He was a government employee and a union member and their government was out of control on all levels, and that was why he had voted for the three new Commissioners. He was proud of the job they were doing and they were accomplishing exactly what they had stood for when they ran for office, and it was much appreciated. He knew they were getting tremendous pressure from all sides, and he appreciated them standing strong in their beliefs.

Mr. Steele stated in fact, he expected them to stick to their promises of creating a leaner, more streamlined County government. It was his understanding that they had in fact not eliminated any measures designed to protect their environment that were in place. They were doing a great job of providing good common sense government in Chatham County, something that had been lacking for a very, very long time.

Rita Cileo, 356 May Farm Road, Pittsboro, NC, presented her comments to the Board and provided them in their entirety for the record as follows:

"I find it unconscionable that Commissioners Brian Bock, Walter Petty and Pam Stewart voted to eliminate the Environmental Resource Position and Green Building Staff in the Budget by their 3 to 2 vote. A very hasty decision was made by them with no afterthought of the consequences including canceling the remaining budget work sessions.

I want to thank Sally Kost and Mike Cross for standing by their convictions and voting against this travesty of justice.

Mr. Brian Bock stated in one of his question and answer sessions earlier in the year that creating an environment that fosters job growth and job retention will be his top priority. So how is eliminating these key positions doing that?

Placing environmental resources, sedimentation and soil erosion control under Waste Management is a mistake. Do you really want to cross train individuals to assist in monitoring environmental protections? What background would these individuals have and how would they be cross-trained. We can't tread lightly on important environmental issues with inexperienced workers who do not have the background in environmental protection. The separate departments should stay separate. They are too important to be lumped under one department. It will be too chaotic and will not streamline operations. Monitoring the pollution levels in our drinking water reservoirs is key to getting ahead of pollution and preventing costly clean up and with that you need Environmental Resource to be one department.

Pittsboro gets its drinking water from the Haw River which is impaired causing unhealthy drinking water. Why I even have to spend close to \$1,000 per year on bottled water because I don't have the confidence in the quality of my drinking water. Why should I be afraid of the water my grandchildren will drink or bathe in. I have received well over 15 Notices to the Public in the past years concerning the town's violations for high TTHM's in my drinking water. Why eliminate the Environmental Resource Position who works with the federal and state agencies to help improve our waterways like the Haw River and Jordan Lake so we can have clean drinking water because don't we all deserve a basic necessity in life like clean water to drink. Our soil erosion must also be monitored to prevent sediments from reaching water bodies. We all know that sedimentation is by far the largest pollutant to our waterways namely our Haw River and Jordan Lake.

I put faith and trust in my elected officials to pass laws and regulations that will give me and my grandchildren safe water to drink and improve our waterways that supply our drinking water thus enhancing our environment. Eliminating key positions like Environmental Resource is doing just the opposite.

But, Commissioners Brian Bock, Walter Petty and Pam Stewart have cast their votes to jeopardize our environment by eliminating crucial positions and they will have to live with that. I will have them to thank when I receive another notice of contaminated water. I will have them

to thank when our waterways stay polluted. I will have them to thank for soil erosion because key positions have been eliminated

In closing remember that a clear conscience is a soft pillow and your decisions regarding this budget affect everyone. Sally Kost and Mike Cross on the other hand won't have to worry about their conscience because they did the right thing by the people and voted no against this budget. Sadly that wasn't enough."

Gina Dye, 173 Olde Farm Road, Pittsboro, NC, presented her comments to the Board and provided them in their entirety for the record as follows:

"There was a speaker recently at a BOC meeting that made a statement reminding the Commissioners to remember that they represent all the citizens of Chatham County. I found this an interesting statement since I am pretty confident that this individual felt the previous Board of Commissioners did represent all the citizens of Chatham.

A couple of points in regards to this: We had an election in November and the results were evidence that the previous board members were not representing the wants and needs of the Chatham citizens. A change was called for and the new board of commissioners should be allowed to work for the citizens of Chatham without having to deal with all of the nasty games from those that cannot accept they do not represent the majority of Chatham County, especially from those serving on this board calling for "pitchforks".

While many long time residents of Chatham County may be registered as Democrat, it is not an indication that they support liberal or progressive agendas. Most of the long time citizens that I have had the pleasure of meeting are conservative at heart and want to preserve the heritage of Chatham while promoting common sense growth and development. They do not support larger and more expensive government at the expense of higher taxes nor loss of constitutional rights.

I have been a resident of Chatham County for 8 years now. I grew up in a suburb of Los Angeles, raised by parents that had moved from the mid-west looking for better opportunities for themselves and their children. But something happened over the years, as the politics of California became more and more liberal and progressive. The safe small town I grew up in became a haven for illegal aliens, many which were gang members. By the time I was in high school, I was the minority on campus and faced violence many days, even to the point of being chased from school with bottles, rocks and angry mobs, all because of my skin color. I finally had to leave that town a few years later when I had become a wife and mother as the neighborhood I lived in was shot up by drive by gang members.

You might think what does this have to do with Chatham County? I can tell you, it has everything to do with Chatham and the events taking place here in the past few years. If the conservative members of this county do not start speaking out and standing up for what is right, this county will be just like El Monte, California. We already see evidence of it taking place in Siler City where the violence and gangs are taking over what was once a nice safe small town. I close with voicing my support for this board of commissioners to continue using common sense to govern, doing all in their powers to return Chatham County to a safe place to live and work. I do feel that this board represents all the citizens of Chatham unlike the previous board. I ask all the citizens to begin to talk about the difficulties we as a community are facing and find ways to get involved with finding the solutions. The board of commissioners cannot do it without us, and we cannot sit silently by or we might as well make plans to start searching for another safe community to live in, because it won't be here if we wait for someone else to do it."

Tom Kost, 1101 New Hope Church Road, Apex, NC, stated he was a molecular biologist and had a lot of experience in his field. He had previously volunteered his time with the Economic Development Corporation biotechnology cluster group, and hoped that his broad experience and contacts in the biotechnology arena would help to bring some jobs into Chatham County. That was why he questioned the abandoning of the cluster group approach for economic development, because it seemed to be a reasonable and wise approach that originated from the County's economic development plan. No one had explained to him why the approach was abandoned, and in fact there had been no communication at all with the biotechnology cluster group.

Mr. Kost stated that they knew when a company was looking for a place to locate they were looking at many factors regarding the community, with quality of life being high on the list. They knew companies heard about good schools, recreational opportunities, and infrastructure including high speed Internet. It was both disappointing and frustrating to see the Commissioners spending more time and effort cutting County staff, reducing County services, and environmental oversight rather than directing their energy to promoting the County's well thought out economic development plan. He had to agree with Jeffrey Starkweather on this.

Mr. Kost stated that President Obama said that they should have hope; they needed it. He hoped the Commissioners had a vision for Chatham County beyond streamlining.

Tom Glendinning, 160 Eddie Perry Road, Pittsboro, NC, presented his comments to the Board and provided them in their entirety for the record as follows:

"I support the Board of Commissioners in their decisions. They were all duly elected and represent the people of Chatham County."

Tom Krombach, 696 Sam Jones Road, Chapel Hill, NC, presented written comments as follows:

"I agree with rescinding the current ICE policy. The Hispanic Liaison should not be encouraging illegal behavior. They should be helping those here legally. And I support the budget changes as well. I am tired of the government at all levels thinking they have unlimited title to the fruits of my labor. Most of us out here are struggling and are getting by on less each year while our taxes continually go up. It's time to stop this on all levels."

Commissioner Petty stated that it was difficult sometimes when they found themselves on opposite sides of an issue, and it was not intended to be personal but was what people believed. He respected that and believed each of them should respect that, and the Board wanted to hear what citizens had to say and valued what they had to say. In defense of Commissioner Kost, she and he had had their differences and were on different sides of an issue. For some reason they were able to civilly discuss that, and occasionally it may get somewhat elevated and somewhat loud, and in fact anytime where there had been an exchange that did not seem appropriate he and Commissioner Kost had come together and discussed it and made amends. He had felt the need to say that because Commissioner Kost had made the effort to come to him and discuss their differences.

Commissioner Kost thanked Commissioner Petty for his comments, noting she believed there had been some mischaracterization about what had happened. For those who believed she was a horrible person who wanted to pitchfork people, that was a comment that was made on her Facebook page and not a comment that she had made. She apologized if that had offended anyone, but it was totally something made in jest and it was blown a bit out of proportion.

Commissioner Petty stated in regards to Commissioner Kost's comment that things were blown out of proportion, he believed that was what had happened with a lot of issues the Board would be discussing tonight. Some of the things the Board had talked about was that the ERB was designed to obviously make things more efficient but also to broaden their base of people involved in the process and not to destroy the environment. He had lived in Chatham County his entire life and this was home to him, and he did not want to see Chatham County destroyed.

Commissioner Petty stated that the problems that they were experiencing and had experienced in the past pertained particularly to development. Guidelines had changed since then; they were not the same. They were not eliminating those guidelines, and they did not expect to see rivers running red with runoff from development like it had many years ago, because the ERB had done a good job in establishing some guidelines that the Board had adopted. He recognized that and the Board of Commissioners recognized that. He hoped that the public would see that their intent had not been to destroy what was done but to simply reorganize it. Reorganization was taking place in businesses and entities all over the world, and he hoped they heard his heart in that they truly were not trying to destroy the environment. It was an attempt to reorganize things, to broaden their base to give them more people to function, and not do away with the ordinances and guidelines that were established.

Commissioner Petty stated he believed the public needed to hear the Board's hearts. When it came to the ICE resolution, everyone was entitled to their opinion and their position on issues. The previous Board had taken their position, and had said that they strongly opposed their law enforcement and agents being involved in any way with immigration control. That was not a decision for the Board to make. Their law enforcement was both by the oath they had taken when they took office, and their law enforcement answered to the citizens. This was not something the Board decides. They had the same opportunity as a Board to state their position just like the previous Board had done.

Commissioner Petty stated he also wanted citizens to hear the fact that he realized the immigration had contributed greatly to Chatham County, and a lot of the jobs that were getting done would not have been done without some of the immigrants that were here. He had a compassion for people, particularly people who were disadvantaged. He had spent many, many hours and weeks in Haiti doing mission work because he loved people and had a compassion for them. This was not to destroy a group of people and was not to destroy a sector of people, and was not in any way to single a group of people out. Regardless of how much you cared for people, you had an obligation to do what was right. That decision was to be made by law enforcement and not this Board. He had simply taken a position that he wanted to get out of the way of law enforcement so they could do what they had taken an oath to do.

Commissioner Petty stated the reason for his remarks was to clear up some of the misconception that seemed to be presented during public input sessions. It came across when you heard people speak that the Board wanted to run everyone out of the country and they wanted to destroy the environment. These were not issues. What the Board was doing had been misrepresented and blown out of proportion and it was not accurate.

Commissioner Petty stated it was his intent with his comments that the public hear their hearts and hear exactly what the Board was trying to do, and that the public's opinions were not distorted by nonfactual comments.

MINUTES - MAY 16, 2011

Chairman Bock stated for those who were present at the May 16 meeting, the motion when they approved their Agenda and Consent Agenda was to do just that. The last time they had added a piece as it related to public input and extending time for that. It was all one Agenda and it was pointed out that when Commissioner Petty and he had voted no, they in fact had not only voted no to the section that they were trying to vote no to but had ended up voting no to all of their Consent Agenda items. He wanted to have the minutes corrected to indicate that that had not been their intent, in that it was two separate issues.

Commissioner Kost suggested they have a motion to include in tonight's minutes that that had been the intent. Chairman Bock stated that was acceptable.

Commissioner Cross stated that under each of those issues should be a statement that said that it was not the intent of Chairman Bock and Commissioner Petty to vote against that particular issue.

County Attorney Jep Rose stated it was his advice to rescind the previous vote on the Consent Agenda and restate the motion.

Commissioner Cross moved, seconded by Commissioner Stewart, to rescind the May 16, 2011 Consent Agenda vote. The motion carried five (5) to zero (0).

Commissioner Cross moved, seconded by Commissioner Stewart, to approve the Consent Agenda for the May 16, 2011 Board of Commissioners' meeting.

Commissioner Kost asked if that was sufficient for the County Attorney, in that making that motion seemed odd to her. The County Attorney stated it was sufficient.

The motion carried five (5) to zero (0).

Commissioner Kost moved, seconded by Commissioner Petty, to approve the Board Minutes for the Regular Meeting held May 16, 2011. The motion carried five (5) to zero (0).

PLANNING AND ZONING

Public Hearing:

Text Amendment to Zoning Ordinance- Environmental Review Board (ERB): Set date to schedule a public hearing for July 18, 2011 on a text amendment to the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance to remove the Environmental Review Board from the review process for conditional use permits

Commissioner Petty moved, seconded by Commissioner Stewart, to schedule a public hearing for July 18, 2011 on a text amendment to the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance to remove the Environmental Review Board from the review process for conditional use permits.

Commissioner Kost stated she would support the motion simply to provide an opportunity to hear from the public. She was not in favor of doing this but did believe hearing from the public was important.

Chairman Bock called the question. The motion carried five (5) to zero (0).

Item from March 21 and April 18, 2011 public hearings

Revisions to Text Amendments to Section 11.3 and 10.3 of the Zoning Ordinance: Request by the Chatham County Board of Commissioners for text amendments to the Chatham County Zoning Ordinance to delete the requirement for an Environmental Impact Assessment on non-residential, general use zoned properties in Section 11.3 and to add "Telecommunications Towers" in the list of permitted uses in Section 10.3 as a correction to an earlier amendment

Jason Sullivan, Chatham County Planning Director, explained the specifics of the request. The Board had held a public hearing on March 21 which was continued to April 18. There were two parts to the request, with the first portion being to remove the Environmental Impact Assessment requirement for General Use zoned non-residential projects and the second portion was to add "Telecommunications Towers" back to the list of permitted uses, which was a correction to the 2008 Zoning Ordinance amendments.

Mr. Sullivan said that all the comments that were received at the public hearings were related to the Environmental Impact Assessment amendment. The Planning Board discussed that at its May 3 meeting and voted 6-3 and one abstention to recommend approval. A summary of the Planning Board's discussion is included in the packet.

Commissioner Stewart moved, seconded by Commissioner Petty, to accept the Planning Board (by a vote 6-3-1) and Planning Staff recommendation, approve the text amendments to remove the requirement for an EIA on non-residential, general use zoned properties, as directed by the Board of Commissioners at their Retreat in February, to add Telecommunications Towers to the Zoning Ordinance and adopt **An Ordinance Amending The Zoning Ordinance of Chatham County**, attached hereto and by reference made a part hereof. The motion carried four (4) to one (1) with Commissioner Kost opposing.

Public Hearing:

Text Amendments to Section 505 of the Watershed Protection Ordinance: Public hearing to receive public comments on a request by the Chatham Board of Commissioners for a text amendment to the Chatham County Watershed Protection Ordinance to Section 505, Establishment of the Watershed Review Board, to designate the Planning Board as the Watershed Review Board

Mr. Sullivan explained the specifics of the request, noting that when the Watershed Protection Ordinance was adopted in 1994 the Planning Board was delegated responsibility to serve as the Watershed Review Board, and that authority was delegated to the ERB in 2009. The WRB had the responsibility to decide on appeals of the Watershed Protection Ordinance and also decide minor variance requests. The amendment would need to be reviewed by the WRB and that was tentatively scheduled for their June 16 meeting.

Jeffrey Starkweather, 590 Old Goldston Road, Pittsboro, NC, stated in response to Commissioner Petty's remarks he took the assumption that everyone in the room and in the County were sincerely arguing what they really believed. He then presented his comments to the Board and provided them in their entirety for the record as follows:

"Chairman Bock and Commissioners Stewart and Petty, you have identified yourselves as conservatives. However, whatever your intention it appears to me, based solely on your alleged conservative ideology, personal experiences and anecdotal evidence, that the effect of your actions concerning streamlining environmental regulations and procedures, including removing from Environment Review Board serving as the Watershed Review Board, as well environmental staff budget cuts, is to gut Chatham's environmental protections.

Yet, true conservative principles support environment protection, according the views of most major conservative thinkers, as quoted by John Bliese, in his well-documented book "The Greening of Conservative America." See <http://www.amazon.com/Greening-Conservative-America-John-Bliese/dp/0813338026>. Similar strong connections between conservatism and environment protection can be found at the Republicans for Environment Protection website, where it indicates that potential Republican Presidential candidate John Huntsman will be their keynote speaker at the annual Theodore Roosevelt Banquet in July. See <http://www.rep.org/>.

Bliese lists nine core conservative principles and explains how each support vigorous environmental protection. The first six include: conservative is not materialist, freedom is a critical value whose corollary is responsibility, private property and the free market are fundamental social institutions and piety, especially toward nature, should be its governing attitude. "No generation has a freehold on the earth, the later conservative British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher stated in explaining the conservative principle of intergenerational equity. "All we have is a life tenancy – with full repairing lease."

Conservatism's intellectual founder, Edmund Burke, ranked the eighth conservative principle- prudence- the first of all virtues. Prudence requires acting with caution, deliberation, and modern, stated conservative intellectual giant Russell Kirk. It means "judging any public measure by its long term consequences," he wrote. As our watershed ordinance addresses, we rely on volunteer scientific experts to prudently protect its ecosystem services to purify our water, generate soil, recycling wastes, and protect wildlife, among many others.

Finally, the ninth principle is that conservatism is non-ideology. "Conservatives do not believe the world is perfectible," Bliese explains, "so we must act with humility..." which means, "conservatives will be pragmatic is applying their principles to the solution of real-world problems."

Clearly, keeping our volunteer services of professional environmental experts to review watershed impacts of proposed developments is both prudent and pragmatic. It is also more efficient and effective than turning this back to the planning board, which is made up of political appointees who generally do not have professional scientific training and experience in watershed management and ecology. Protecting the environment should not be a partisan issue. It isn't for most Chatham residents.

A recent nationwide poll on political typology by the Pew Research Center found that among Main Street Republicans, 66% disagreed with the statement "stricter environmental laws and regulations cost too many jobs and hurt the economy." Unfortunately, 92% of ideologue Tea Party supporter Republicans agreed with this statement. Fortunately, this poll showed the Main Street Republicans represented the majority of self-identified Republicans.

Main Street Republicans' understanding of the importance of environmental protection represents the views of the overwhelming majority of Chatham residents. Those residents understand the importance of protecting and enhancing our natural resources and rural character for attracting good paying jobs and expanding our tax base.

Thus, let us follow these true conservative principles application to the environment and reject this proposal to remove the ERB from acting as the Watershed Review Board, as well as this board majority's wholesale attack on Chatham's prudent and pragmatic environmental protections, procedures, and policies."

Judy Harrelson, 118 Greentree Lane, Siler City, NC, presented her comments to the Board and provided them in their entirety for the record as follows:

“I am speaking in support of the Environmental Review Board. I sat on the CC Planning Board for 4 years. At the beginning we were not in a recession and had good economic development. There was lots of work for the PB to do and we spent long hours discussing the details of each development in order to make an educated decision. In almost all cases on bigger projects, we had to postpone our decision for one or even 2 meetings because we didn't have the information or experience required to make a fair assessment in the best interest of Chatham County. When the ERB was formed it was a huge benefit to us. We now had an experienced and knowledgeable team of biologists, botanists and scientists who could advise and answer our environmental questions. Quite frankly, they were able to speed up the process so we didn't have to carry the meeting over to another night. Time is money for a developer. Postponing a decision for one or two meetings means holding up the developer's money for 30 to 60 more days. This can make or break a small developer.

The purpose of the new Subdivision Regulations changed the process further so that the developer and the county could do all the planning work up front during the least costly time period for the developer. When the project then came before the PB and the developer has money tied up with the bank, the process became much more efficient and quicker with all the questions answered, saving the developer money at this critical time.

The ERB enabled us to have the answers we needed. We now had all the information available at the first meeting when the project initially came before the PB. So now the process was fair and efficient and it allowed the planning board to make educated recommendations to you, the BOC, that were based on facts and were in the best interests of both the developer and the county.

We are fortunate in Chatham County to have professional scientists so willing to serve as volunteers on the ERB. It's an incredible resource that doesn't come along every day. And, it doesn't cost the county one penny. In fact based on my experience, it actually saves money for the county and the developers in the form of time.

The ERB is not a regulatory board, just advisory. Their advice is free. What you do with the information is up to you, but why not be as informed as possible when you make your important decisions on the future growth of this County?” Please keep the Watershed Review Board under the ERB.”

Carolina Sieverson, 5560 Castle Rock Farm Road, Pittsboro, NC, presented her comments to the Board and provided them in their entirety for the record as follows:

“I have lived in Chatham County for more than 27 years. I am speaking to you tonight as a board member of Chatham Citizens for Effective Communities and as a former Chatham County Planning Board member who served during the time when the Planning Board acted as the Watershed Review Board.

Earlier this year, Chairman Bock offered us his definition of streamlining as “continual improvement,” which he states is what we should always be working toward. He went on to say that when streamlining and improvement are at odds with each other, improvement always should trump streamlining.

Therefore, CCEC is completely mystified that the BOC majority now seeks to remove the important responsibilities of the Watershed Review Board from the capable hands of the ERB, who have served us well in that capacity for the past 4 years, and place those responsibilities back in the hands of the Planning Board. This can only be rationally seen as a big step backward. Hardly an improvement!

As a former Planning Board member, I can tell you with certainty that I lacked the scientific background and expertise needed to analyze complex watershed issues. Furthermore, the Planning Board, acting as the Watershed Review Board, will likely not be qualified to recommend amendments and changes to the Watershed ordinance. Why not have volunteer professional experts, working on behalf of the citizens of Chatham, advise and guide you as you

make critical watershed decisions? Continual improvement of our natural resource safeguards should indeed trump streamlining, and clearly this text amendment fails to do so.

The larger question here is for whom will this backward move be an improvement? Certainly not the citizens of Chatham County, whom you have sworn under oath to serve. The assertion that policies that protect natural resources have a negative impact on economic development is unproven and misguided. There is no false choice between economic development and a clean and safe environment. We really can and should have both.

CCEC urges the Board of Commissioners to listen to the citizens of Chatham County, to heed the advice of the current Watershed Review Board on this issue, and to reconsider and reject this regressive text amendment to the Chatham County Watershed Ordinance.”

Allison Weakley, 175 Lauren Rose Lane, Pittsboro, NC, stated that she was a biologist and conservation planner for the State, and was also the founding chair of the ERB and had been an active member since its creation in 2007. Commissioner Bock was quoted in the Chatham News and Record as a part of a County press release about the public hearing set for the Watershed Protection Ordinance, which said “It made sense for the WRB’s responsibilities to be handled by the ERB over the past few years when major policies and ordinances were developed and enacted related to stormwater management and other watershed issues.” He had then gone on to applaud the ERB’s work which she thanked him for, but he had then had said that “Given that those changes have been accomplished it is time to return these duties to the County’s Planning Board as part of the streamlining process.”

Ms. Weakley stated that as a member of the ERB and a person who had worked very hard for this County and their natural resources, she would appreciate a statement that backed up the assumption that the ERB’s work was done because they now had policies and ordinances in place and that the expertise and the knowledge and the understanding of ordinances by the ERB was no longer needed in this crucial task of the WRB, especially given the Jordan Lake Rules that were upon them and all the advice that the ERB could provide the Commissioners for sound, informed decision-making.

Ms. Weakley stated she did not understand the logic of why they would take the WRB tasks and put them back with the Planning Board who did not have the expertise needed as was just stated by speakers before her. She wanted a public statement acknowledging why the change. She also wanted to remind them that the WRB was placed with the Planning Board originally because there was no other board in the County to serve that goal, and when the ERB was created in 2007, it seemed apparent that the ERB should have the task of serving as the WRB because the membership consisted of professional people with a lot of expertise and knowledge in environmental matters and regulations. She would like to have more information about why the text amendment was proposed.

Larry Ballas, 139 Indian Creek, Apex, NC, stated he was an environmentalist and wanted things to remain clean. He stated he lived near Jordan Lake and had been fighting Cary since 1995 to keep Jordan Lake clean, and that was before there was an ERB. He saw no reason why a voluntary organization needed to be associated with an involuntary organization. They were not appointing stupid people to the Planning Board so that they could not make decisions, but more importantly could they make a decision to ask for the expertise of someone in the County when such expertise was needed. He asked would the ERB fall apart because they were no longer a part of the Planning Board; and, if yes, then they were not interested in helping Chatham County. The ERB could still remain together as a group and act as an independent watchdog over what was happening environmentally to the rivers and lakes of Chatham County. If they had a Planning Board that was appointed to take care of the planning and zoning issues in Chatham County, were they so stupid they could not ask for help regardless of whether there was an ERB?

Mr. Ballas stated they needed to use common sense here, noting the Board was trying to streamline the process. Over the years they had done a good job of keeping Chatham County environmentally clean and environmentally safe, and not once had they approached the seven counties surrounding them to say they were polluting Chatham County. Durham polluted the northern part of Jordan Lake and everyone knew that but no one talked to Durham about it. Cary polluted Jordan Lake in the northeast but no one talked to Cary about it. Orange County also

polluted Jordan Lake, and Burlington and Greensboro and many others polluted the Haw River.

Mr. Ballas stated he did not see the Commissioners saying to do away with the ERB, but to make it an independent organization that could be called on when needed for environmental expertise if the Planning Board needed help.

Emily Lancaster, 1000 Jay Shambley Road, Pittsboro, NC, stated that as a taxpaying, water drinking, food eating citizen, she felt she had everything to lose and nothing to gain from the transferring of the stewardship of the water they all depended upon to the Planning Board. They had been fortunate in this County to have a group of knowledgeable, scientifically grounded objective professionals that donated their time to assist the County in striving for the highest environmental quality, and she was speaking about the ERB which currently served as the WRB. With all due respect to the members of the Planning Board, environmental protection was not their expertise. Having a qualified review of the effect of new projects was a check on the balance between the power between the Planning Board and the citizens impacted by its decisions. You might call that troublesome; she called it democracy.

Ms. Lancaster stated a speaker before her had warned that consumers ended up paying for regulation, but they also paid for lack of regulation in environmental degradation, depleted resources, and poor water quality. Since economics seemed to be the common language here, she wanted to reiterate that the qualified members of the ERB were working for free for the long term benefit of the County. In the interests of the citizens of Chatham County, she respectfully requested that the Board continue to allow them to do so.

Kate Dunlap, 1322 Mt. Olive Church Road, Pittsboro, NC, presented her comments to the Board and provided them in their entirety for the record as follows:

“I am speaking to you tonight as a citizen who has attended numerous Environmental Review board meetings, including meetings when the ERB convened as the Watershed Review Board. The ERB is a group of knowledgeable, competent, and committed citizens, many of whom are highly credentialed and accomplished in their fields, which include public health, law, geology, soil and water conservation, biology, farming, and more. The co-chair, Elaine Chiosso, knows as much about the Haw River basin as anyone in the State. It seems to me that you as commissioners, as well as any responsible developer, would welcome the help and advice of such an expert panel.

So, the proposal to transfer the responsibilities of the Watershed Review Board to the Planning Board is baffling. It’s difficult to see how this action contributes to fiscal “streamlining” because the ERB operates at a negligible cost to the county. And it’s hard to see how having the Planning Board act as the Watershed Review Board would save time. The Watershed Protection Ordinance is a long, detailed, and technical document. If done with due diligence, it would take significant time for Planning Board members to get “up to speed” on the details of this complicated ordinance. And any appeals to the Watershed Review Board should be carefully considered, regardless of who conducts them, or how much time it takes.

And speaking of time, isn’t protecting our environment and water quality worth the necessary time for thorough deliberations? We all know that water is a serious issue here. Protecting this resource isn’t only important to our health, wildlife, and recreation, but it’s also a primary budgetary consideration. Water that’s filled with sediments and pollutants from runoff isn’t only unhealthy, it’s also very costly to treat.

This reminds me of the old adage, “Measure twice, cut once.” When it comes to watershed protection, we should take all the time we need to measure properly, and we should measure with the best tools we have.”

Sharon Day, 1312 Woody Store Road, Pittsboro, NC, stated that while she agreed with many of her fellow speakers about the very importance of paying attention to watershed issues, she supported leaving those issues with the expertise of the ERB but from a somewhat different angle. Water regulations and environmental regulations were not a general burden as they were sometimes described to specific businesses in the area. She was a part of a business that grossed over \$600,000 in this County and they were very dependent on good, well delivered and well thought out regulations, as well as their enforcement by intelligent informed people. Her business brought in a lot of money to the County from outside the County, and it was spent

inside the County with jobs, services and supplies, and they existed because the regulations existed.

Catherine Deininger, 124 Goldberry Lane, Pittsboro, NC, presented her comments to the Board and provided them in their entirety for the record as follows:

“Biocenosis, LLC is a Chatham based partnership of environmental professionals who have been involved in natural resource projects throughout North Carolina over the past twenty years. We recommend that the duties of the Watershed Review Board (WRB) remain with the Environmental Review Board (ERB), and that those duties not be turned over to the Planning Board (PB).

Biocenosis was formed two years ago from the vision of five passionate environmental professional women committed to promoting responsible community stewardship of natural resources by empowering local people to participate in solving environmental issues in their own community. For us, the Environmental Review Board is exactly the way we believe decisions should be made to ensure that our natural resources are protected in a way that is inherently in keeping with the needs of the citizens of Chatham County.

The primary responsibilities of the Watershed Review Board are to make recommendations to the Board of Commissioners on text amendments to the Watershed Protection Ordinance and to decide appeals and variance requests.

Understanding the ins and outs of Watershed Protection Ordinance and the ramifications of appeals and requests for variances to that ordinance are not simple. We think it is vital that the county has the advice from experts with the scientific credentials and knowledge to make these decisions. Recommendations by the ERB to the board of commissioners are advisory only, and the ERB members are non-paid volunteers. There is no financial gain only a loss of scientific knowledge to county to be made by eliminating the role of ERB as the Watershed Review Board. Thank you.”

Randy Voller, 21 Randolph, Pittsboro, NC, stated that there were a few people present tonight that were in the construction industry and those in that industry were waiting for recovery to occur but it may not happen soon enough. An article in a recent U.S. News and World Report issue that talked about that recovery but had not talked about other regulatory or streamlining issues as problems they had in their industry. It said that they would continue to experience double digit unemployment rates for a long time, and one of the problems was lack of credit. The biggest issue they faced in their industry was tight lending standards, the inability to acquire money, and demand. Housing starts were anemic due to those tight lending standards and foreclosures that caused inventory to swell and depressed prices.

Mr. Voller stated that though he applauded this Board and the previous Board for their work in trying to explore methods for helping their economy through either new regulatory ideas or trying to lessen those regulations when it made sense, when it came to the ERB he did not believe they had given it a chance to see what effect long term that would have. Frankly, most of the great development they had was before the previous Board was seated because by 2006 the economy had already begun to turn and they were stuck with a huge inventory. He was sitting on lots he was paying taxes on that he could not turn, as he would guess many in the room were doing the same, and those were not dependent on the issue of streamlining. They were dependent on the issue of supply and demand and unfortunately credit which they could not get.

Mr. Voller added that in Pittsboro, of which he was the Mayor but he was not speaking as the Mayor, they had a fairly fast process for the approval of projects and were not subject to some of the same rules as the County. But, the reason they did not have a hotel at Lowe’s Plaza or at Powell Place was due to the issue of demand and the issue of credit. Pittsboro had hundreds of thousands of square feet approved on the ground since 2006 that could not be built, which they would very much like to see built. It was not being built but that was not due to the problem of streamlining.

Mr. Voller stated he had had dealings with all of the members of the ERB and as a developer he was usually the enemy. Many years ago Catherine Deininger, the previous speaker, had rebuked him and told him he was causing a sediment problem. He had gone to them and

learned how to clean up his practices to prevent that from happening again, and believed that most people in his business wanted to protect the water.

Jennie DeLoach, 484 Boothe Hill Road, Pittsboro, NC, presented her comments to the Board and provided them in their entirety for the record as follows:

“I have lived in Chatham County since 1982. The designation of the Planning Board as the Watershed Review Board is merely a way to eliminate the Environmental Review Board as part of the development process. It is to the need for and ERB as part of that process that I direct my talk.

I spoke before you a few weeks back on the issue of the ERB. At that time, I brought up the fact that the ERB is made up of scientists, and that they are not paid.... Two facts that Brian Bock had not known when he ran for County Commissioner. I said that, because he had previously told me he wished there were scientists on the ERB and that the reason he was against it was because it cost too much. Of course the cost he was referring to was the cost to developers.

Well, I am **not** a developer, but I **am** a land owner in Chatham who has two developments coming in on either side of my property. Westfall lies to the South of my piece and Lystra Roads lies to the West. I would like the county commissioners to give **me** as much concern and protection as they hope to give the developers. The ERB does not stop development, it just helps make it better for those that buy into the developments, and those whose property lies near them.

As all of you know, we have a fragile ecosystem. Peter Theye posted a letter to the Chatham Chatlist today where he showed pictures of the devastation brought on by 2 developments that were built before the ERB was added to the development process. A picture is worth a thousand words. I'd wanted to just do a 3 minute slide show of those pictures, but since I didn't have it together to show that slide show, I'm going to have to hope that our County Commissioners take the time to look at what happened when we had no ERB in Chatham County. I only hope that after you see those pictures, you will decide that there is more to the development process than the cost to developers.

I told y'all last month that the folks handing out sample ballots in front of Chatham Downs this past fall were telling folks that Brian Bock was an environmentalist. If you ever plan to run for County Commissioner again, do not dare put the word environmentalist next to your name if you vote to get rid of the ERB. Thank you.”

Diana Hales, 528 Will Be Lane, Siler City, NC, presented her comments to the Board and provided them in their entirety for the record as follows:

“The Watershed Review Board is part of the County's Watershed Protection Ordinance and this Board is the official appeal process for county residents who want to challenge a decision by the County's Watershed Administrator.

Currently the Environmental Review Board functions as the Watershed Review Board. They bring the scientific expertise to review these appeals and consider any appropriate variances from the county Watershed Protection Ordinance.

There is no reason to shift this responsibility from the volunteer ERB to planning staff that lack those areas of scientific expertise.

In fact, the Watershed Protection Ordinance serves to promote a healthier Chatham County through rules and guidelines that you should be proud of, and not trying to diminish. For every bad practice by a developer or earthmover, there is a price paid in the downstream waters in Chatham, a potential cost to public health in terms of drinking water quality, and an absolute cost to neighboring taxpayers who lose intrinsic value in their right to enjoy their property.

Watershed Protection is the cornerstone of having a thriving community that retains rural and scenic characteristics and attracts new residents and businesses. Since we have entered an extended period of drought in this part of North Carolina, according to the State Climate Center,

the preservation of our watersheds will absolutely make a difference in how Chatham families thrive.

Why entrust that to the non-experts on the Planning Board when you have an alternative that has been working for the County, at no cost, for four years? Keep the Environmental Review Board active as advisory so you can make your best decisions for this County.”

John Alderman, 244 Red Gate Road, Pittsboro, NC, presented his comments to the Board and provided them in their entirety for the record as follows:

“For nearly 30 years, I have worked as a biologist to help conserve North Carolina’s natural resources, particularly our state’s creeks and rivers. These waters have become the drinking water supplies for the majority of state citizens. Therefore, for our health and economic survival, it’s critical that we better conserve these waters.

It is impossible for the private sector to know what’s best to protect these waters. Many developers and others in the private sector have limited ecological understanding, and often ignore permit limits, regulations, and government agencies. It happens more often than anyone realizes. In a major way, that’s why so many of our state’s freshwater mussel and fish species are considered endangered or threatened by the scientific community. Sadly, their rates of decline are accelerating. This should frighten every citizen and official, given that so many of us drink this same water that our aquatic species need for survival. As long as these species can live in our waters, we can be assured of clean, healthful water. For many citizens in North Carolina and Chatham County, that assurance is no longer possible.

My advice to you is very simple: Fully support and strengthen our existing environmental programs. Instead of cutting staff or reducing their responsibilities, increase staff positions to support our environmental programs. Do nothing to weaken your Environmental Review Board, and wisely listen to and incorporate their advice. If you do contrary to this, people will become informed of your activities, and they will learn just how increasingly endangered Chatham’s waters are becoming. If this information becomes common knowledge, the growth and prosperity you desire for the minority will never occur.”

Commissioner Stewart asked if the data Mr. Alderman had shared was data that he had compiled himself or did he pull it from somewhere else. Mr. Alderman responded he had pulled the information together himself.

Chairman Bock thanked everyone for their comments and said once the Commissioners had had the opportunity to discuss the issue, he would like to provide the Board the opportunity to take a vote if the Board would like to do that.

Chairman Bock stated that as everyone knew, the Board did not get together before the public meetings and determine their decisions, so many times issues would be brought up that caused a lot of discussion and they gathered information along the way. Sometimes they would change their mind based on that information and sometimes they would not. As they heard the comments and read the emails and they got data on their own, the tough part was whittling down the comments that actually had to do with what the Board was proposing.

Chairman Bock stated that the Board was in no way saying that the job of the ERB or the WRB was going to be eliminated. The question then became was it more efficient to move the duties of the WRB to the Planning Board or leave it with the ERB. When they brought up those kinds of topics the idea was to get the discussion going. He was a big advocate of efficiency and streamlining and he would not apologize for that, because he believed they could continually improve those kinds of things. Some of the points made tonight he had also been thinking about. Absolutely the Planning Board or the WRB, whoever that was, could seek advice from another board even if that other board was not a part of the process. And, he would expect them to do that. The question in this case was if it was more efficient if they had to do that. He would say, probably not. They did have experts on the ERB which they had all acknowledged, they were doing the job of the WRB, and he would tend to agree that if they moved that task to the Planning Board that the efficiencies you might pick up from going from one board instead of two would likely be lost in going back and asking for advice.

Chairman Bock stated that speaking for himself that in this case, and based on the data he had collected and the comments he had heard, would lead him to vote against the amendment and keep the WRB with the ERB.

Chairman Bock stated that for the record, he had never called himself an environmentalist and did not know who had done that.

Commissioner Cross moved, seconded by Commissioner Kost, to leave the Chatham County Watershed Review Board with the Environmental Review Board. The motion carried five (5) to zero (0).

COMMISSIONERS' PRIORITIES

Adoption of FY 2011-2012 Budget Ordinance: Adoption of FY2011-2012 Budget Ordinance

Chairman Bock stated that last week the majority of the Board had voted to approve the budget with a couple of changes, but in large part as it was presented to them by staff. At this time, the Board would need to consider the formal adoption of the budget ordinance for the FY 2011-2012 budget.

Renee Paschal, Assistant County Manager, explained that the FY 2011-2012 Recommended Budget was presented to the Board of Commissioners on May 16, 2011. Public hearings were held on May 23, 2011 and May 24, 2011. State law requires that the County adopt a balanced budget prior to July 1, 2011.

The Board of Commissioners held one budget work session and made changes to the Manager's recommendation. The budget ordinance reflects the following changes made by the Board of Commissioners:

Overall, Commissioners increased the Chatham County Schools budget by \$110,096. This amount is earmarked for two teaching positions at Sage Academy. This amount was offset by appropriating Fund Balance. (Note that the County still meets its Fund Balance policy of not appropriating funds for operating. The amount of Fund Balance originally recommended was \$367,373 less than capital outlay projects approved in the budget.)

Commissioners also allocated an additional \$9,700 to Chatham Together! and \$300 to Family Violence & Rape Crisis from \$10,000 set aside for Commissioners to allocate directly. Commissioners also allocated an additional \$1,700 from the general contingency for Family Violence & Rape Crisis.

In addition to changes made by the Board, Staff discovered a mistake in the nonprofit allocation. The \$10,000 set aside for Commissioners to allocate directly was omitted from the recommended budget. This amount is taken from contingency.

General Fund Revenues:

Reason	Change	Amount
	Beginning General Fund	\$82,883,972
Commissioners Action	General Revenues: Increase appropriated fund balance	110,096
	Ending General Fund	\$82,994,068

General Fund Expenditures:

Reason	Change	Amount
	Beginning General Fund	\$82,883,972
Commissioners Action	Increase funding for Chatham County Schools to restore 2 teaching positions at Sage Academy	110,096
Commissioners Action	Increase funding to Chatham Together! from Commissioners nonprofit funding	9,700
Commissioners Action	Increase funding to Family Violence & Rape Crisis from Commissioners nonprofit funding	300
Commissioners Action	Increase funding to Family Violence & Rape Crisis from contingency	1,700
Commissioners Action	Decrease contingency	(1,700)
Staff Error	Decrease contingency	(10,000)
	Ending General Fund	\$82,994,068

The budget ordinance allocates funding to Chatham County Schools the categories of current expense, supplement, special, one-time allocation for two Sage teachers, capital outlay, and capital improvements projects. The ordinance allows the school system to move funds between capital outlay projects and provides for a quarterly accounting of capital outlay.

The budget ordinance increases the County Manager's authority to transfer amounts from contingency from \$25,000 to \$50,000 to provide greater flexibility in managing the budget.

The budget ordinance increases the mileage reimbursement rate from \$0.50 to \$0.51 cents per mile to match the IRS mileage reimbursement rate. The budget already includes funds for this increase.

The General Fund is \$110,096 more than the recommended budget. There is no effect on the tax rate.

Commissioner Petty moved, seconded by Commissioner Kost, to adopt the FY 2011-2012 Budget Ordinance as presented.

Commissioner Kost read from a prepared statement as follows:

"There are many items in the Chatham County budget that I feel that I must address. We have made cuts to direct services to our citizens that simply are not necessary.

First, why are they not necessary? Our policy provides that we can pay for one-time items from our fund reserves, which is a healthy 27 percent of our General Fund balance, far above our 20 percent target. These one-time items include \$40,000 for software in the manager's office, \$60,180 for software for central permitting and Capital Improvements Projects totaling \$367,373. So my question is, if we have over \$22 million in reserves, and our reserve level is higher than our own policy dictates, why are we not making these appropriations totaling \$467,553 from Fund Balance?

If we did, we could do one of two things. We could reduce the tax rate by one half cent. Or we could restore some of the services that our citizens have said are important: such as the additional soil and erosion control officer, environmental protection, food for home bound citizens, the bookmobile, and hours for early voting. And we could add to our appropriation for education.

Chairman Bock says, we need to cut cost now so we can fund new schools in the future. I agree. Building new schools needs to be a high priority and one of the reasons I voted against redirecting the savings from not building the jail to LEED standards, thus expanding the jail budget by \$700,000. Not factored into the future revenue estimates are large improvements at two of our largest County taxpayers – Carolina Meadows and Galloway Ridge. Both of these facilities are undergoing large expansions totaling almost \$150 million to be added to our tax base. What I find so ironic is that many citizens I have heard from about having library service provided in north Chatham are residents of these two communities. These expansions when complete will generate more than \$900,000 in additional revenue. An abbreviated schedule of the bookmobile would cost \$27,500.

And there are also other cuts we could make. We could save around \$68,000 if we have an in-house attorney. We could save \$3,800 if we eliminate dinner for the commissioners. We could cut the commissioner's travel and training budget by at least \$2,000. We could further cut the governing board's travel allowance – let's say by \$100 a month, saving an additional \$6,000. I believe these items are far less a priority than cutting direct services to citizens. And I would support all of them.

So the question is, do we really need to cut the bookmobile, or environmental protections, or food for home-bound citizens and hours for early voting? I would say no, if it is about the money.

I have been for the last week preparing an alternative plan to address the concerns that we heard from so many Chatham citizens. But then our budget work sessions were cut short when the budget was abruptly passed. I also am not comfortable voting for the tax increases in this

budget, without first hearing from the fire departments and from staff about why we are increasing these taxes.

I will be voting against the budget tonight for all of these reasons.”

Commissioner Petty stated to be clear the 27% Commissioner Kost had referred to was a little higher than their normal Fund Balance, but they also knew that they would be having quite a bit of increase in operating expenses over the next couple of years and that that 27% would be drastically reduced, so it would be back in line shortly. They did not just consider a snapshot of the budget or of the Fund Balance, but looked at the overall Fund Balance over time. It may look like a higher than normal balance, but that was not a long term position. Nor could they count on additional revenue or an increase in their tax base until they actually had it, because something may happen and that was delayed, causing them to have expenses they could not accommodate because of the delay in increased revenues.

Commissioner Kost continued from her prepared statement as follows:

“There is a great deal of contingency in this budget. Don’t get me wrong, I believe in conservative budgeting. But this budget is ultra conservative. In addition to not making use of our fund balance, each capital project has a contingency. Additionally, we have a contingency for fuel. We have a contingency for the jail. We have an overall contingency. We budget 100 percent salaries, even though we know there will be vacancies during the year. Staff tells us that revenues are underestimated by two percent. Discoveries are not budgeted. And on top of all of this, we have a healthy Fund Balance.”

Commissioner Kost stated her point was that she believed that this budget had a lot of contingency built into it, and that even though they were appropriating a little less than \$800,000 in Fund Balance, they would probably add to the Fund Balance next year because this was a very, very conservative budget.

Commissioner Stewart stated in regards to the revenues, they had to remember the amount of operating expense increase they would see based on some of the development they were doing today, and making sure they had funds to cover that in the event that the real estate market did not recover anytime within the next two to three years. From what she understood, they could possibly be facing a double digit recession as well as another decade before they saw any recovery at all in the housing market. They had been very fortunate in Chatham County.

Commissioner Stewart stated they also had to remember that they had a great disparity between citizens in terms of income in this County. Her biggest concern was that if they started talking about spending what they had in reserve today and then tomorrow things had not gone the way they had expected and they did not have as much money as they had thought, they would have to raise taxes on everyone. Surprisingly she had people say to her that the Board should raise the property taxes, but there were people who really could not afford it and were struggling to feed their families and to hang on to their property. She was very concerned about that, and would rather err on the side of being conservative than to come up short later and have to scrounge to find the money. If they had it, and after they had gotten through a process and determined they could actually afford to spend it on particular things, then they could feel good about it and not feel that they had shortchanged their citizens.

Commissioner Kost stated that everything she had proposed could be done without increasing taxes.

Commissioner Stewart replied “this year.”

Commissioner Kost stated she believed for future years as well. If those houses were not built then they would not need the new schools.

Commissioner Stewart said that was not her understanding.

Chairman Bock stated they were already aware that they needed a new high school.

Commissioner Stewart stated they needed a new elementary school as well.

Commissioner Kost stated that the elementary school was not in their capital plan.

Chairman Bock agreed, but they knew that it was needed.

Commissioner Stewart stated the elementary school was actually a greater need than the new high school.

Chairman Bock stated they knew they had millions of dollars of operating expenses over the next few years that had to be paid for, and believed it was a philosophical difference. He was opposed to raising property taxes to pay for those if they could find additional cuts. Even with this budget, unless they incorporated new cuts, they would still have to raise property taxes to pay for some of the things in the CIP such as the new high school. He did not want to raise property taxes, and he would continue to look to find reductions in the budget.

Commissioner Stewart stated they had heard the Board of Education and the Schools say they would come back next year to ask for even more money than was requested this year, so they knew that going forward there would be that continued need for growth. Also, cuts to training were mentioned, and she was all for giving up any money allocated to her for that purpose, and she also had no problem with paying for her own meals. Her concern about that was for the County employees who had worked all day and were still on the job because they were attending this meeting, so they had already put in a 12-hour day and it was not yet over. She knew that even in corporate America when you had someone that worked a certain amount of hours it was part of the policy to provide them with a meal in that case. For her personally, she had no problem cutting that out for her.

Chairman Bock stated that was one of the very first things they had tried to do, but it had not seemed to work.

Commissioner Cross stated it had been pointed out at that time that if they were to provide staff with the per diem cost of holding them over after the normal work time that it would be more expensive than providing a tray of sandwiches.

Commissioner Stewart agreed that was true.

Chairman Bock stated that the budget did incorporate about a 4.6% reduction in Commissioner costs and they were a mandated board, and technically what they asked for was a 4% reduction and they had been given a 4.6% reduction.

Commissioner Cross stated he had voted against the budget last week because he was surprised about some of the issues, but after a few days to reconsider he would be voting in favor of it tonight. The staff and the County Manager had done an excellent job of bringing in what the Board majority had requested and it was a sound budget. He realized that they had a budget process that had changed, but they still had a proposed budget amendment process. He had sent out a budget amendment proposal on Saturday morning to the Manager and the Chair, and by mid-afternoon he had gotten it on the agenda for the June 20 meeting, so that process was still alive. Anything the Board did not get to discuss could always be brought back to the table by any Commissioner that wanted to talk about it. He reiterated that he would be voting in favor of the budget tonight even though he had voted against it last week.

Commissioner Stewart stated when looking back at the previous process one of the things she noticed was that even though you went through the budget item by item and discussed it over a period of time, that even in those cases at certain points throughout the year there were issues brought back and some adjustments were sometimes made. Basically, she would think that that would have to happen, in that there would always be opportunities for some changes to be considered, to hopefully do things better and to improve what had been decided. The big thing for her in all of that was she wanted to make sure that staff understood that the Board had sat down with them at the retreats and went over the budget for three days. They had discussed what the Board would like to see done, and then had said to staff what the Board wanted to see come back and that was exactly what staff had done. The feeling was that staff knew better about what was happening within their departments and any recommendations that they made about cuts she had felt comfortable with. Staff had had the opportunity to state that they had nothing to trim without devastating consequences, and she would have been open to hear that. But, staff had done a great job and she trusted what they had done. Basically she was all about

accountability, in that you let someone do their job and trust them to do that unless they showed you otherwise. She had sat down with Rene Paschal and had gone over every single item she had questions about, and Ms. Paschal was able to respond to every question she had brought forward. So, she had felt very comfortable with what had been done, and agreed with Commission Cross that staff had done a great job and she applauded them for it. She believed what they had now was a very sound budget.

Commissioner Kost stated what she understood they had done at the retreat was to set a guideline for non-mandated lower priority services, and had made education and public safety their two top priorities. But what they had also said was that for non-mandated services, identify 5% cuts. They had not said to cut it by 5% but only to identify 5% in cuts, and she believed that had gotten lost in translation. She believed the departments had thought they were going to take a 5% cut no matter what. She would have liked to have had the opportunity to discuss some of those cuts with the department heads as they had done in the past. She had asked the Council on Aging would they have cut the in-home meals program for homebound seniors if they had not had to, and the response was of course no. They had cut the one day per week for senior citizens in Siler City, so they had made cuts to direct services that many citizens depended on.

Commissioner Kost stated she, too, applauded staff and believed they had done an incredibly good job. She supported many of the cuts, but believed that some of them had gone just a little too deep because they impacted environmental protection as well as direct services to citizens that really depended on it.

Commissioner Stewart stated that after the meeting was over she and Ms. Denison had talked about that cut and its effect. She said of course Ms. Denison had said she would have rather no cuts been made, but anyone asked that question would respond in the same manner. One of the things that Ms. Denison had indicated to her and that she would be hearing more about at the end of the month was that that particular program did definitely need to be revamped. As a matter of fact, she had some firsthand input from someone that actually delivered some of those services to individuals who had given her some observation of areas where things could be done better. She had asked Ms. Denison how many people the cuts would affect, and she had told Ms. Denison that she would be more than happy as a citizen that if there was someone that would go hungry that needed that meal who would not now receive it she would buy it out of her own pocket. She believed there were many people in the County, including church groups and other organizations and individuals that would be more than happy to do the same if they knew that a senior was going to go hungry. The idea was that the Board wanted to make sure they were providing services to those in need, but at the same time they wanted to make sure that it was being done in the most efficient and cost effective way, and that they were looking at what they were doing and not just passing out funding without thought.

Commissioner Stewart stated one example of cutting the budget but retaining a service was with the funding for the commuter bus between Pittsboro and Chapel Hill. They had cut that funding but had retained the service, so they needed to continue to look for opportunities to reduce spending but retain services in some other way and do it a little differently. She was not in favor of cutting anyone out that had a real need, but there was always the opportunity to find a better way to provide it.

Commissioner Kost stated she really appreciated this discussion and it really re-emphasized her point that they should have had their work session on the budget so that they could have continued this dialogue because she believed it was healthy dialogue. That was one of the purposes for the budget work session, so she hoped that next year that they as a Board would continue a process where they had a little more discussion about the next budget.

Chairman Bock called the question. The motion carried four (4) to one (1) with Commissioner Kost opposing. The Ordinance is attached hereto and by reference made a part hereof.

Discussion of Draft Policy for Advisory Committees:

Debra Henzey, Director of Community Relations, the Board of Commissioners provided feedback on the proposed policy at its April 4 and April 18 meetings, with the goal of having a consistent policy of operations, accountability and reporting for all non-mandated committees/boards that are appointed by the commissioners and are not governed by state or

federal requirements. The copy of the policy has been revised to reflect changes made by the Board of Commissioners at those meetings. If adopted, the draft policy would potentially apply to the following existing advisory committees/boards:

- Affordable Housing Advisory Board
- Agriculture Advisory Board
- Environmental Review Board
- Grand Trees of Chatham
- Green Building & Sustainable Energy Advisory Board
- Human Relations Commission
- Library Board
- Planning Board (optional)
- Recreation Advisory Board
- Solid Waste Advisory Committee
- Transportation Advisory Board

The updated policy includes the revisions made by the Board of Commissioners but also includes one change highlighted in yellow on pages 5-6, as recommended by the County Attorney. This clarifies the State requirements for meeting via teleconference to comply with public access to meetings.

The Addendums included for consideration are:

- **Addendum A:** Compilation of all advisory committees that would come under this policy and specific information about mission, membership and meetings for each of them. We did ask for and received helpful clarifying information from these groups. **Note that the Appearance Commission is not listed.** Because it was established by county ordinance, it has been removed from the list of committees covered by this policy.
- **Addendum B:** Guidelines and form for committees to use when making annual reports to the Board of Commissioners, which should be scheduled through the Clerk to the Board of Commissioners.
- **Addendum C:** Conflict of Interest Policy that would apply to all advisory committees under this policy. Note that some list additional conflict requirements under Addendum A. The County Attorney has reviewed this policy.

Ms. Henzey stated that we are seeking final approval of the policy and addendums with an effective date of **August 1, 2011** so that we have some time to work with the groups on a transition.

Commissioner Stewart moved, seconded by Commissioner Petty, to adopt the policy as amended. The motion carried five (5) to zero (0).

Resolution to Rescind Prior ICE Resolution: Approval of Chatham County Board of Commissioners Resolution to Rescind Prior ICE Resolution

Chairman Bock stated that in 2009 there was a resolution passed as it related to local law enforcement and ICE. Some of the Commissioners disagreed with that resolution and thought it was too broad in that it spoke for the entire County when in fact it did not. Because of that he had proposed a new resolution and a lot of feedback had been obtained, resulting in a few amendments to that proposed resolution. The new resolution did what the first resolution he had presented did without so much wording and it was a compromise. But, they did not really need a new resolution in that what they were really trying to do with the resolution he had originally proposed was to rescind that January 5, 2009 resolution. So, the new resolution simply stated “Be It Resolved that the Chatham County Board of Commissioners rescinds the resolution on the Federal Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) program approved on January 5, 2009.”

Commissioner Petty moved, seconded by Commissioner Stewart, to adopt **Resolution #2011-32 Rescinding Prior ICE Resolution.**

Commissioner Kost stated when the original resolution was passed the backup information talked about how they all felt that immigration reform was an important priority. They just had not thought that the ICE 287G program was the vehicle to take the issue of immigration. This was a very complicated issue and believed they sometimes tended to over simplify, but the ICE 287G program did not work; it did make communities less safe because it made it more difficult to solve crimes. Most law enforcement would tell you that the way crimes were solved was community interaction and if people were in fear of law enforcement they were not going to have that interaction.

Commissioner Kost stated that additionally the 287G program was expensive to administer. One of the speakers at the last meeting had referred to a report from 2010 done by the Inspector General which contained 33 recommendations to improve the program. One of those was that the federal government was pushing down their responsibilities to local law enforcement agencies and that meant that local law enforcement had to pick up the costs. Many people would say that it was worth the cost if it would take care of getting dangerous people out of their community, but statistics provided by John Graybeal showed that ICE was not picking up hard core criminals but only those people committing petty crimes so it was not effective in ridding communities of felons. All the evidence told them that the ICE program caused racial profiling, and that really did sadden her and was sure it saddened all of them. That was why they needed comprehensive reform.

Commissioner Kost stated that the Board was making a clear statement to the federal government that the County was telling them that they were not going to do their jobs and the federal government should do their jobs and pay for it. She believed that by passing that resolution that was what they were telling the federal government. Today they had gotten an email that the State of Massachusetts had said that the Secure Communities program had caused all sorts of problems, it was not effective, it was not addressing immigration, and they wanted no part of it. She applauded the Governor for the State of Massachusetts because he had sent that message to the federal government that they all should be sending, which was that they wanted comprehensive reform.

Commissioner Kost stated that they had heard from many people about all the issues dealing with the ICE 287G program and she continued to support the original resolution adopted in 2009. She would be voting against the motion made this evening to rescind it.

Chairman Bock encouraged everyone to read the original resolution adopted in 2009, because it was not a resolution on 287G. There were several paragraphs that talked about 287G but the part of the resolution that really counted was the "Be It Resolved" paragraph. That paragraph stated that the Board at that time stood in strong opposition to local law enforcement working with State and federal law enforcement in any capacity where you had to sign a memorandum of agreement. If it had said 287G they would be having a different discussion. That original 2009 resolution had gone on to say that the resolution was passed on behalf of all the residents of Chatham County, and a resolution was an opinion of the Board and not a reflection necessarily of all the residents of the County. The 2009 resolution was not on 287G; perhaps it was intended to be but that certainly was not what it said.

Chairman Bock stated they heard a lot about Secure Communities, but whether you were for or against the original resolution it did not affect Secure Communities nor did the one before the Board tonight. Secure Communities does not require a memorandum of agreement. Whether that was in place or not in place had no impact whatsoever on Secure Communities. Furthermore, they could not pick and choose which laws they wanted their law enforcement to enforce.

Commissioner Cross stated he did not want to rescind the resolution the Board had adopted in 2009, noting he had voted to approve it and he had not changed his feelings about it. But, after seeing what was proposed and considering that all law enforcement was sworn to uphold the law, he had considered this not a reflection on any sector of citizens but a compromise that the County could use. It did not do anything to law enforcement and they could not tell law enforcement what to do even though the Board controlled the budget, but they could not afford to pay for what law enforcement would be required to do out of tax dollars if local law enforcement had to get involved in some complicated apprehension. He appreciated the Board majority being willing to compromise, and certainly did not want something stronger in the opposite direction of what had been passed in 2009. So, he would be supporting the motion.

Commissioner Stewart stated that from her standpoint there was no doubt that they badly needed some sort of immigration reform as well as tax reform. But, they could not refuse to pay their taxes because they did not agree or did not think it fair. This was an emotional issue because they were talking about human beings and human life, and when you started talking about those types of humanity issues it did become an emotion issue.

Commissioner Stewart stated one of the things she continued to think about and that resonated in her head was the oath of office they had taken to uphold the law, and they had sworn to uphold the Constitution of North Carolina and the Constitution of the United States. Whether she liked them or not, she was bound by her oath to uphold those laws so she could not in all good conscience say that she was going to vote on something that said she was not going to uphold the law. She would like to see things change, but that change would have to come from a higher power than Chatham County to really see any reform, because basically law enforcement would do what they had to do. Whether they realized it or not, things that law enforcement did electronically would allow them to detect people who were in this country and this County illegally, and she trusted law enforcement that they would not be profiling people and were not out rounding people up and chasing them down in the streets because they were suspected of being illegal. After talking with Sheriff Webster she had been reassured that that was not happening and they did not have the manpower to do that.

Chairman Bock stated if in fact their Sheriff's Department was conducting racial profiling, which they were not, and if there was any evidence of that, that was a completely different topic to discuss and had nothing to do with the discussion taking place now in terms of this resolution. If someone had evidence otherwise, then the Board would want to see it.

Commissioner Kost stated she wanted to make the point that participating in the 287G program was not a requirement of local law enforcement. It was an optional program, and one of the speakers had made the comparison that local law enforcement was not out collecting back taxes for the IRS, and paying your taxes was a federal law. The County was not in the business of enforcing federal laws, and it was the federal government's responsibility to do that.

Commissioner Stewart stated that they were not out there doing that.

Chairman Bock stated the point was that the 2009 resolution was not a 287G resolution, and if it had been then they would be having a different discussion. He also noted that someone had given to him today a petition with approximately 250 signatures asking that the Board rescind the 2009 resolution. It was not all one sided, noting that the Farm Bureau had officially said that they supported rescinding the 2009 resolution.

Chairman Bock called the question. The motion carried four (4) to one (1) with Commissioner Kost opposing. The Resolution is attached hereto and by reference made a part hereof.

BREAK

The Chairman called for a short break.

COMMISSIONER PRIORITIES

Chatham County Bicycle Plan

This item was deferred until another meeting.

Discussion of Potential Chatham County Transportation Improvement Projects (TIP): Presentation on the Chatham County Bicycle Plan and discussion of potential Chatham County Transportation Improvement Projects (TIP) by the Melissa Guilbeau, Transportation Planner

Commissioner Kost stated that at the last meeting she had had some questions about what they were suppose to provide to the MPO, and she had asked would that include some safety improvements such as the intersection of Mann's Chapel and Andrews Store Roads, turning lanes on 751, and turning lanes off of Jack Bennett Road onto Big Woods. She was not sure

what they were being asked to provide would include some of those which were really safety issues, or whether it would come from a different source of funding within DOT.

Melissa Guilbeau, Sustainable Transportation Planner, explained that all of those could have certainly been included in their request to the MPO and it could have been vetted there with DOT. The MPO had told her that the Technical Committee had already made its recommendations, but the Advisory Committee would not be voting until June 22 so they were certainly welcomed to submit more projects to them. But, any new projects would not be a part of the staff level recommendation but could be considered separately by the Advisory Committee. If the Board wished to request that more projects be recommended for the prioritization process they could certainly do so.

Commissioner Kost stated then in that timeframe they would not be able to get input from the Transportation Advisory Board. Ms. Guilbeau responded that was correct. Commissioner Kost stated she would have liked to have gotten their opinion, noting the projects she had mentioned were areas where she had heard concerns expressed over the years. She asked would it hurt anything to add those now for the Advisory Committee process. Ms. Guilbeau replied she did not believe so, noting that the prioritization process was a wish list that was formed and prioritized according to established criteria, so if others were put it they may or may not get ranked high.

Commissioner Cross stated he believed they should add those projects, because at times DOT had been known to identify additional pockets of funding.

Commissioner Kost moved, seconded by Commissioner Cross, to approve the submission of the following projects to the MPO:

Improvements to intersection of Mann's Chapel and Andrews Store Road
Turning lanes along 751 at New Hope Church Road or anyplace where turning lanes were needed off of 751; and
Turning lane off Jack Bennett Road onto Big Woods Road

The motion carried five (5) to zero (0).

Ms. Guilbeau stated to clarify she would have to develop some cost estimates for those project, and would contact Commissioner Kost to clarify exactly what she had in mind.

Discussion of Board of Commissioners' Meeting Room:

Ms. Paschal explained that since the early 1990s, the Chatham County Board of Commissioners has not had a permanent meeting space. Meetings have been held in Superior Court, District Court, the Agriculture Auditorium, the Central Carolina Community College (CCCC) Multipurpose Room, etc. For several years the Board has discussed having a permanent meeting space, including the 964 East Street Building ("Performance Building"). A permanent space would give the opportunity for a higher quality sound system, make videotaping meetings easier, and eliminate the need to set up and break down meetings, which causes wear and tear on equipment and furnishing.

If Commissioners want a permanent meeting, several options exist:

- **964 East Street:** When FirstHealth vacates the space it rents from the County, approximately 7,500 square feet would be available in this building. Part of this space could be upfitted for a Commissioners' meeting room. This option is likely the most costly as no infrastructure currently exists for the meeting space. A public occupancy requires approximately 10 square feet per person, so the space could be sized to hold up to 600 to 650 people. This space offers adequate parking. Because the meeting room would be in back of the building, the space does not have a street presence.
- **Historic Courthouse:** When the historic courthouse is rebuilt, the second floor courtroom will be available for Commissioners' meetings. Because the space is currently being planned, the County has a unique opportunity to upfit the space for a Commissioners' meeting room without a great deal of additional expense. The benefits of the space are its formal presence and a large meeting room with capacity for

approximately 300 people. The drawbacks are the lack of parking. In addition, the shared use with courts would require that the meeting space be set up and torn down for each meeting.

- **Temporary Superior Court/Old Pittsboro Memorial Library:** With minimal renovations the temporary courtroom space could become a Commissioners' meeting room with seating capacity of approximately 80-100. In addition, the improvements to the law enforcement site would offer adequate parking for the building. This building has the advantage of being able to serve as a permanent commissioners meeting space and video and audio systems could be permanently set up, so that staff time required for meeting set up would be minimal.

Based on direction from Commissioners, staff will obtain cost estimates for the preferred site. Ms. Paschal stated that staff recommends that the temporary superior courtroom be designated the permanent Commissioners meeting room and that the historic courthouse be used for ceremonial occasions and meetings requiring greater seating capacity.

Commissioner Cross stated he liked that idea and believed that by the time they got that built they would have ample parking available.

Chairman Bock agreed.

Commissioner Kost stated that the plan had been to consolidate and pull together and provide space to their MIS department, so if the Board were to take that space what did that do to the overall space plan and how would they shuffle people around. Ms. Paschal stated it accommodated MIS now and for a bit of future growth, but it did not accommodate the long term growth they would need to remain in that building.

Commissioner Kost stated her only other concern was that the Board meetings seemed to be drawing a larger crowd these days and that the room would not be adequate for many of their meetings. Ms. Paschal stated if the Board felt that they needed only one space, then the best option would be the historic courtroom. Commissioner Kost stated that would be the way she would lean, but it appeared that staff believed the space would be adequate for most meetings. It would be nice to be able to make a decision based on numbers as well as cost. Ms. Paschal stated those would be brought back to the Board before any final decisions were made, but at this point staff was seeking direction from the Board.

Chairman Bock stated that most of the time they were aware when a larger crowd was expected and they could then make the adjustment to move to the historic courtroom. He stated he was in favor of staff's recommendation.

Commissioner Kost stated she believed she would support the recommendation for now, at least until staff came back with more information.

By consensus, the Board accepted staff's recommendation that the temporary Superior Courtroom be designated the permanent Commissioners' meeting room and that the Historic Courthouse be used for ceremonial occasions and meetings requiring greater seating capacity.

MANAGER' S REPORTS

The County Manager reported on the following:

“Bulldogs” for the Budget:

The County Manager stated they had just completed a very difficult budget, and whether you liked the budget or not he had not heard anything that suggested that the Board did not like the way the budget was put together. In the comments he had made leading up to the public hearings he had commented about staff being “bulldogs for the budget” and he now had something to permanently remind staff of that. He presented miniature porcelain bulldogs to the Assistant County Manager, Renee Paschal, Finance Officer, Vicki McConnell, and Lisa West, Budget Analyst, who had performed incredibly during the process with a lot of work, a lot of dedication, and a lot of time. Hence, they were now “Bulldogs for the Budget”.

COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS

Broadband Meeting:

Commissioner Stewart stated it appeared they would be getting feedback from their local providers of the Internet and cell service that they may be able to have a Town Hall meeting on June 23 at 6:30 PM. The plan was that they had invited representatives from Centralink as well as AT&T, Verizon, Time Warner and others and many had already accepted the invitation. Someone from the e-NC Authority would also be present to talk about what they did and how they could help the County with getting Internet service in the County as well as improved mapping.

Commissioner Kost stated she was very interested in that as were many of the other Board members, and said she understood that this was Commissioner Stewart's individual Town Hall meeting. But, she as a County Commissioner wanted to attend and there may be others, and because they would be discussing County business would they be in violation of the Open Meetings law if Commissioners attended that meeting and discussed the issues as Commissioners. Mr. Rose replied they would not be in violation simply by attending as long as the meeting was properly noticed. Commissioner Kost asked had previous Town Hall meetings been noticed. Mr. Rose replied yes. Commissioner Kost stated she understood that the meeting was for citizens, but she had heard many remarks from citizens who were interested in high speed Internet service and believed she should be able to participate.

Commissioner Stewart stated the purpose of the Town Hall meeting was to answer questions from citizens. She had substandard access as did many others, and during the meeting they would also be discussing the map and who had access to what as well as correcting some discrepancies on that map. She was facilitating the meeting by inviting representatives that could answer questions from citizens and to give those providers the opportunity to present to the citizens about where they were now and where they were going. But, they had to remember that there would be representatives from competing companies present so they were not going to be willing to talk about everything their company had planned over the next five years. They would be able to respond to particular concerns from people in certain areas as well as respond to questions about how to move forward. Hopefully, very soon Action Audit would be coming before the Board to provide its presentation and there would be some options proposed with that report.

Commissioner Kost thanked Commissioner Stewart for bringing all of those people together into one room so that citizens would have the opportunity to have their concerns and questions addressed.

Invocation:

Commissioner Petty stated he wanted to make a statement regarding the public input remarks made about the Constitution and prayer. He was a person of faith and persons of all different faiths made America what it was. He was generally called on to give the invocation, and in his faith he could pray to no one but Jesus Christ because that was his belief. For that reason and because of his conviction he would ask that someone else be called on to pray. He wanted it known that it was not intended to be a bold statement but was simply his position and his faith. If someone wanted to pray in a different manner that was fine and he had no issue with it. But because of his conviction he could do it no other way, and if that was the position of the Board and staff he would ask that someone else provide the invocation.

Commissioner Cross stated that was exactly why they had gone through that discussion with the ACLU in 2005. They used to begin the meeting and then have a prayer, and now they had the prayer and then began the meeting. They had invited other denominations and had tried to set up a county-wide list of ministers of all faiths who would come in and offer a prayer, but that had not worked because people did not show up.

Commissioner Stewart agreed, noting she had the same faith as Commissioner Petty. She did not have the right according to the Constitution to force that on anyone else, but she did have the right by the Constitution to believe the way she believed and not be persecuted for it as did everyone else. As far as she was concerned, she would not be able to offer a prayer in good conscience to anyone other than Jesus Christ.

Chairman Bock stated he did not believe the Board needed to take any action and that there was nothing wrong with the way they had been praying. He believed if they read the First Amendment, praying before the meeting started was not the government establishing a religion. The First Amendment also talked about unfringing the freedom of speech for someone to practice their religion, and he did not believe anything that the Board had done the last six months or the last seven years violated the Constitution.

Commissioner Kost asked that they get the legal opinion of the County Attorney, because there was case law that did not support the position that it was Constitutional.

Commissioner Petty stated that was fine, and if that was in fact the case then he would no longer do it. And, if the Board wanted to do something different that was fine as well. He was only stating his position.

Chairman Bock agreed they should get the County Attorney's opinion on that before the Board decided to make any change. He stated he did not believe they should change what they were doing until they received a legal opinion that they needed to make some change.

County Commissioner Districts:

Commissioner Kost stated at the last meeting the Board was presented with various maps for the new County Commissioner Districts and believed they were going to try to have a public hearing on June 20th. They had an issue with the two previous maps presented, in that on both maps they had three members of the Board of Education in one district and the Board of Education had said that they would like to have their districts in sync with the Board of Commissioners. She had met with their GIS director to see if they could address that. Because they currently had four Board of Education districts it was impossible to achieve that, so in District Five there were two members of the Board of Education, but in each of the other districts other than District Three there was one member.

Commissioner Kost stated as well, what she had tried to do for both Siler City and Pittsboro was to keep the ETJ within one Commissioner district. With Siler City because of the population that was impossible. If they had the public hearing, she would ask that the Board consider that map, noting the two issues she had outlined were the only things she was trying to address in developing it. She thanked County staff for working with her to develop the map.

Joint Land Use Committee:

Commissioner Kost stated the Wake County Board of Commissioners had a vacancy, and the Democratic Party had nominated Cary Town Councilman Portman to fill that vacancy. That had to be approved by the Wake County Commissioners and if that was true she would ask that this Board for continuity drop back and have two members of the Chatham Board of Commissioners and two members from the Town Council serve on the Joint Land Use Planning Committee, because she believed it would be difficult to bring in a new third person from the Town of Cary who had not been involved in the meetings. Since the Board had only been seated for six months, perhaps between Commissioners Petty, Bock and Stewart one of them could drop out and entertain decreasing the size of the Committee from Chatham.

PUBLIC INPUT SESSION CONTINUED

Phillip Canterbury, 2109 Bonlee School Road, Bear Creek, NC, stated he wanted to voice his support for the three new County Commissioners. He had worked for them during the election and he was very proud of what they had accomplished so far. He was looking forward to them accomplishing a lot more. He had been a resident of Chatham County almost 35 years, and drove 100 miles round trip every day to work outside of the County. He could now see a little light at the end of the tunnel with the members now on the Board, and possibly his grandchildren may be able to work in Chatham County. Wouldn't that be awesome? God bless them and his prayers were with them.

Randy Voller, 21 Randolph Court, Pittsboro, NC, stated that the Town of Pittsboro had wrestled with the same issue regarding the prayer, and had eventually decided to ask for a moment of silence at the beginning of each meeting. He suggested they could save themselves

some time by asking the Pittsboro Town Attorney, Paul Messick, for the information he had gathered.

Mr. Voller stated in terms of issues of immigration, there was a book entitled “What Blood Won’t Tell” which talked about the country’s past. In trials involving questions of Black and Native identify, the law equated Whiteness with full social and political citizenship. An individual was White if he proved himself capable of acts of civic participation and only if proven White would he be allowed to vote, to marry a White person, to live where he wanted, and to participate fully in society.

Mr. Voller stated that at the turn of the century, for the first time, who could become a formal citizen of the United States became a burning question on the national agenda. This was not only an era of massive immigration of new groups to the United States but also a time of legislative and political efforts to restrict that immigration. In the courtroom the question was how would the United States recognize citizenship among the thousands of new immigrants from Europe, Asia, and Mexico once they were here. Could any immigrant to the United States become an American citizen, or would some people be barred even from formal citizenship. Federal courts wrestled with these questions in trials over racial identity of national groups; Armenians, Syrians, Japanese, Mexicans, and South Asian Indians.

Mr. Voller stated that the Federal Immigration and Naturalization Act made formal citizenship an issue of racial identity by limiting naturalization to free White persons since 1790 and people of African nativity since 1866. The largest influx of immigrants that had been yet seen in America occurred in the late 19th century and early 20th century as hundreds of thousands of eastern and southern Europeans entered U.S. ports. Italians, Poles, and Germans as well as Jews from all other eastern Europe faced hostility because of their Catholic or Jewish religious identify and their real or imagined radical politics as well as their swarthy resemblance to people of color.

Mr. Voller stated that was when some of his family had come to America. They had faced overt discrimination in employment, housing, and public accommodations. Some nativist ideologs and political demigods even spoke of them as separate and inferior races. Yet, despite the discrimination and racialization they faced these Europeans were never deprived of U.S. citizenship. They became naturalized citizens, voted, attended White schools, joined the Armed Forces, served in White units, and married White people without restrictions. In all of these important respects, these Europeans were “White on arrival.” Indeed, their Whiteness was established by means of their contrast to people whom America understood as Black.

Mr. Voller stated that by contrast, immigrants from Asia and Mexico faced a very different legal, political and ideological regime in California and southwestern borderlands. The first Asians to arrive, Chinese and then Japanese, worked on the railroads and the gold mines and in agriculture. Likewise, most Mexican immigrants worked in agriculture. In the 19th century these Asian and Mexican immigrants were nearer to peons than free wage workers, degraded in status in order to provide cheap plantation-style labor not unlike the freed African-American slaves.

Mr. Voller stated he provided that information just as a background as the Board dealt with such issues, noting he believed it was important to be educated about the history of their country when dealing with such important issues.

Sarah Long, 320 West 11th Street, Siler City, NC, presented her comments to the Board and provided them in their entirety for the record as follows:

“Supporters of the new ICE resolution say that one of its main goals is to support local law enforcement agencies as they enforce the law. But when a program like 287(g) is implemented in a county and local law enforcement have to take on the additional responsibility of becoming de facto immigration agents, it actually hinders the work of local police and sheriff offices as they work to keep community members safe because it erodes trust in law enforcement and makes people afraid to call the police after they or their loved ones have been victimized.

My job is to work with immigrant crime victims, and I have seen firsthand that many people in our community are already afraid to call the police when they have been victimized. For example, a mother recently revealed to me her fear of calling law enforcement to report that

her young daughter had been sexually abused, even though the daughter was a US citizen, for fear that doing so would endanger other members of the family. This mother did summon up the courage to make the report, but how many other people do not?

When people are afraid to call the police, we are all less safe. Perpetrators of crime feel emboldened to victimize more and more people. The safety of our society depends on the idea that when people see crime, they'll report it to law enforcement. When police functions are mixed up with immigration functions that system breaks down, and everyone in the community suffers. We all want Chatham County to be the safest, best place it can be, and we can help continue to ensure all of our safety by supporting the separation of local law enforcement functions and immigration functions. Thank you."

Sandra Forrester, 358 River Bluff Drive, Pittsboro, NC, presented her comments to the Board and provided them in their entirety for the record as follows:

"The 2009 ICE resolution, which was **UNANIMOUSLY** approved by the County Commissioners *and had the support of the MAJORITY of residents present at the meeting, recognized that trust and communication with law enforcement is an essential component of public safety.* It also recognized the vital contribution of the diverse population in Chatham and was approved so that the civil rights of all its residents would be upheld and not abused.

I have lived and worked in Chatham County for 3 years and as a new arrival myself I have struggled to understand why the immigration debate is such a hot potato here because like no other nation, the USA was built upon the sweat of African slaves, European and Asian immigrants. With the exception of a handful of indigenous peoples who weren't wiped out, **only** immigrants and their descendents live here!

The conditions that drive economic migration result in a work force that is willing and able, hard working and easily exploited. And although immigrant groups have traditionally been outcast and derided, they eventually integrate into this culturally fascinating melting pot of America.

This integration has happened here in NC and Chatham County is **home** to Hispanic, Asian and European immigrants, whether documented or not. Families are settled here and the first generation of immigrants have their own children who are US citizens. And, like citizens, many immigrants are homeowners, high school graduates, business owners and church builders. They are dedicated workers, important consumers but most of all they are honest, law-abiding folk who work hard to give their children better opportunities than they had. The economic well-being of this County would be seriously compromised without their contribution.

Immigration reform, although long overdue and the debate bogged down, is the responsibility of the Federal government. Chatham County is not a sanctuary county when under SCOMM, any immigrant who is arrested here, no matter whether on a criminal or civil charge, is at risk of being deported. Families are being torn apart as a result at an enormous social cost, the consequences of which aren't fully apparent yet. Fostering fear and racial discrimination is no solution to the problem and our tax dollars would be better spent on the police stopping REAL crime rather than enforcing civil immigration law and deporting people for driving without a license.

Commissioners, I ask you to reflect on whether your time and energy would have been better spent on more urgent matters such as making a Chatham County education as desirable as an Orange County education and making Chatham's economy more vibrant than rescinding the ICE resolution. Thank You"

Sonny Keisler, 3006 River Forks Road, Sanford, NC, presented his comments to the Board and provided them in their entirety for the record as follows:

"My name is Sonny Keisler. I live at 3006 River Forks Road. I am here tonight to ask our three new Commissioners to reconsider their overly simple notion that (1) minimum land used controls lead to (2) maximum prosperity. This notion is overly simple because it overlooks three realities.

First: For 25 years I have been engaged in residential real estate development involving such subdivisions as Monterrane, Summer Chill, Falling Waters, Arbor Lea, Eagles Ridge and Meadow Lakes. These subdivisions have attracted customers building homes usually in the \$400,000 to \$1,000,000 price range. These subdivisions have strict land use controls and environmental regulations. This is one of the major reasons all of the lots have been sold at approximately full price. In short, my experience convinces me prosperous people are willing to come to Chatham if you give them strict land use controls and environmental protections both private and public. My experience as a university faculty member tells me the same. I have my PhD in public administration and have taught a variety of courses including planning at such universities such as N. C. State University, the University of Georgia, the University of Alabama and the University of Southern California. This academic experience tells me prosperous people usually prefer well-planned, controlled environments because this protects their sizable real estate investments.

Second: Based on per capita income, in 2008 Chatham County was the third most prosperous county in North Carolina. So ... where is this prosperity located? It is located in that part of Chatham County with the most zoning and in communities with strict land use controls and strong environmental protections such as the Governors Club, Fearrington, Monterrane, and Falling Waters

Third: Consider Cary, Chapel Hill, Sanford and Siler City. Which are the most prosperous? The answer is Cary and Chapel Hill ... the communities with the strictest land use controls and environmental protections. By contrast Siler City and Sanford ... the communities that use the Bock, Petty and Stewart formula ... are much less prosperous .

So ... if you want to promote prosperity – especially in these days of rapid climate change that is certain to undermine prosperity all around the world ... you will give us first class land use controls, first class environmental protections ... and a first class budget supporting the same. As of now, you are not doing this and you are undermining our prosperity. Thank you.”

Kathleen Hundley, 136 Rocky Falls, Sanford, NC, presented her comments to the Board and provided them in their entirety for the record as follows:

“My name is Kathleen Hundley and I live on the Rocky River at 136 Rocky Falls in the Asbury Community in southeast Chatham County. I have owned property there for nearly 30 years.

Now that the Chatham County Budget for 2011 – 2012 has been approved and accepted by the BOC, with apparently no consideration made for a majority of requests for maintaining existing positions, especially in the area of environmental management, and I am confused – for several reasons.

1. What is the purpose of Public Input in Chatham County? I have always thought, obviously erroneously, that Public Input were the opportunity for citizens to speak their minds about issues, “on-the-record,” to which the BOC would listen, re-consider their perspective and that of their constituents and make some requested changes to the draft document, budget or other. Since suggestions made at the last Public Hearing, to keep the administration of environmental management as is, were not included in the final approved budget, mine doesn’t seem to be the correct definition of Public Hearing today in Chatham County.
2. What **are** the changes that the budget lists in positions and responsibilities in the area of environmental management and when can we see **all** of the changes in both position and individual? It would seem that there have been changes in position names and a shifting of responsibilities in positions with new names. It would also seem that responsibilities now under a “new name” position have increased considerably, such that I wonder how **one person**, even with a minimal staff, could possibly acquire all the knowledge in the various areas of environmental management, plus managing the variety of all assigned tasks and duties and handle them efficiently and effectively. It also appears that the new positions will be funded at reduced salary grades. How can we retain quality staff while adding responsibilities and paying them less?

3. When will Chatham County citizens see job descriptions for the “new named” positions? We have heard vague references to the Environmental Resources Director position that has been eliminated, now being shifted to Environmental Services - Waste Management – or is it the “new” Environmental Services Director position? A new department apparently has been created that bundles what used to be several positions into the “new named” Waste Management Department, and my question is, how can one office absorb what used to be several offices with a loss of more than a few key positions and still do an effective, efficient job?
4. What are the academic and experiential requirements for these “new named” positions? Previously, positions were filled by persons who had not only an academic base of knowledge AND impressive experience in managing their positions with a combination of “book learning” and “know how.” As I understand the new administrative assignments, there are persons now who are responsible for tasks for which they have neither academic knowledge or experience or both.
5. Where are the moneys that have been said to have been saved by bundling numerous positions under “new named” leadership? Surely the BOC is aware that doubling up responsibilities on fewer groups is not cost-effective, but adds stress to the worker, delays in providing results, spending ultimately more in employee salaries and benefits and creating a “lose-lose” for administration and citizen alike.
6. During the Public Hearing, there were references made by a few speakers to planning NOW for future fiscal short-falls - a good sense measure that I’m sure we all see as wise planning. But it seems counter-productive to crowd what was an administration that was working smoothly AND efficiently- note the overage in the bank account - in doing the jobs that were appropriately assigned into a new management schedule that appears to this citizen as being “change for change sake,” NOT for a more effectively managed county.

I would ask the BOC to give **clear** answers to Chatham County citizens and **explain the reasons why** major changes that have been made to environmental management are reflected in the newly approved and accepted budget for the coming year, 2011 – 2012 in **direct opposition** to citizens’ requests to leave the environmental management of the county as it has been.”

Charles Allen, 234 Ricky Falls Road, Sanford, NC, presented his comments to the Board and provided them in their entirety for the record as follows:

“I am here tonight to ask two simple questions concerning the environmental policies of our three new county commissioners ... Mr. Bock, Mr. Petty and Ms. Stewart.

My first question is this ... how can you cut environmental protection staff positions by 60% and then say ...” the county’s existing functions related to environmental protection will be continued “? My second question is ... are you trying to talk everyone in Chatham County into believing something that common sense tells us is not true?

Under our previous Commissioners led by Ms. Kost and Dr. Lucier, Chatham County had five budgeted environmental protection positions ... (1) the Sustainable Community Development Director, (2) the Environmental Resources Manager, (3) the Natural Resources Manager and (4) two soil erosion control officers. These five budgeted positions do not include the Green Building and Transportation Planning staff.

Under the new Commissioners led by Mr. Bock and Mr. Petty, we are now down to only one soil erosion control officer ... now renamed Water Quality officer and one environmental tech position. This represents a 60% cut in environmental protection staff.

However this past week Mr. Bock and our County Manager, Mr. Horne released statements that say the following.

“Under the proposal, the county’s existing functions related to environmental protection will be continued ...” (Mr. Horne)

“We will ... cross train staff in various areas of environmental protection ... to ensure we have more people to monitor compliance” (Mr. Horne)

“Funding core services and protecting our environment are key components in this proposal” (Mr. Bock)

“more employees, not less will be able to assist in protecting our environment” (Mr. Bock) .

I can only say ... Mr. Bock and Mr. Horne, your comments are very misleading.

You have cut environmental protection staff by 60%. The fact that you rename the Director of Waste Management as the “Environmental Services Director” does not add any personnel to the county’s environmental protection staff. The fact that you are going to “cross train” some unknown number of fully employed staff – adds little to the county’s environmental management capabilities.

You can pretend that these busy people can master the very complicated chemical, biological, legal and engineering tasks involved in day-to-day environmental management. However pretense is not reality. Because of this, what Mr. Bock and Mr. Horne are saying to the citizens of Chatham County about these issues doesn’t make sense. Thank you.”

Buddy Denise, 2196 Bonlee-Bennett Road, Siler City, NC, presented his comments to the Board and provided them in their entirety for the record as follows:

“I am here tonight to speak IN SUPPORT of the recent commissioners majority vote to approve the new county budget. Adequate public input was allowed for our citizens to express their views on this budget, in fact several of the people who are here tonight to speak spoke at BOTH the Pittsboro and Siler City public input sessions.

As you travel around the rural areas of our beautiful county, you will see many of our hard-working citizens harvesting and storing hay for possible tough uncertain times in the future. This is exactly what our commissioners did in their budget, and I commend them for swift action.

In closing, I would also like to speak in support of the motion to rescind the ICE resolution passed by our previous Board of Commissioners. Thank you.”

Larry Ballas, 139 Indian Creek Lane, Apex, NC, stated that a few weeks ago he had talked with the Board about fracking, and the CCEC had sent out an interesting article that was relevant to the potential for environmental effects on bringing gas out of the region to supply the State for the next four years or so. He wanted to put on the record a follow-up on that where the EPA administrator confirmed no fracking water contamination. He had sent a copy of that article to all the Commissioners. President Obama’s EPA administrator, Lisa Jackson, admitted just a couple of weeks ago that the environmental risk of hydraulic fracturing was practically nonexistent, and he wanted to submit that article into the record.

Mr. Ballas stated there was so much going on in the environmental areas that it was hard to talk about exactly all the concerns, but a recent study that had come out the end of May involved biodegradable products, and biodegradable products were used a lot by environmental people. Those products were supposed to nicely decay in the landfills when thrown away, but they may be bad for the environment. When you threw those biodegradable things into the landfills and it went through anaerobic degradation, you were producing a lot of methane. That methane became a really bad contributor to global warming. He wanted to bring that to the Board’s attention because they would soon be building a landfill and they may have to go to the more expensive type in order to capture the methane.

Mr. Ballas stated he had recently found an article that had to do with whether the Internet was killing the planet one Web search at a time. You may laugh at that but the amount of electricity that was used by an individual doing Google searches contributed a lot of CO₂ to the environment, up to 10 grams of carbon into the atmosphere for every Google search depending on what you were searching for. Multiply that by the billions of people in the world using the Internet, noting there were 60 million Facebook status updates every day, 50 million daily tweets

and 250 billion emails each day, and you were making a serious dent in some Greenland glaciers. He wanted to bring that to people's attention, especially the environmentalists who complained that they were not doing enough. No matter what they did, they contributed to global warming, and the best thing they could do was to try to minimize that.

Paul Quadras, 258 Bellemont, Pittsboro, NC, stated he wanted to comment on the decision by the Board to rescind the resolution on ICE and the 287G program. He believed the decision was misguided, and what they had really done was send a message to the Latino community and it was not a good one. It said that they were not welcomed here, and he did not know who the Board had talked to in terms of gathering information and opinions, but they certainly had not talked to people who looked like him.

Mr. Quadras stated that not all Latinos were immigrants, and not all Latinos were illegal immigrants. Many of them were U.S. citizens, and in fact a vast majority of them were U.S. citizens. Siler City today was 50% Hispanic and the County was 13% Hispanic and the numbers were growing. The median age of Latinos in North Carolina was 25, and that was a similar number of the community here. That was a very, very young population. He knew that because he dealt with that population every day, and there were many young people. They were looking to the Board for leadership for them, and they were not really getting that tonight. The Board was sending a message to them that they were not welcomed here, and that was a travesty.

Mr. Quadras stated that tomorrow he had to do something that the Board may not do, but he hoped that they would. That was that he had to begin explaining to those young people why the Board did not like them, because that was the message they were getting. He knew that was not what was in their hearts and in the hearts of many of those present, but that was what those young people were going to perceive because they would not understand the nuances. They would understand only the message that was being sent tonight, which was that they needed to be wary. He believed that was a mistake. He hoped that the Board would reach out to the community beginning tomorrow to explain the decision they had made tonight to them, because they were going to misinterpret it. That work had to be done now.

Lauren Maxwell, 7705 Rogers Road, Chapel Hill, NC, and a resident of Chatham County, stated she had lived in Chatham County for ten years and had been an employee of the County for seven years. Over the last ten years she had seen how the County had changed with what immigrants had brought to the County, including social, cultural, and economic life to the County and the U.S. as a whole. There was a comment made by someone in the audience that undocumented immigrants did not pay taxes, when in fact they did pay taxes. They paid taxes for government programs they could not access, such as Social Security and Medicare. To be clear, there was an article in the New York Times that stated that undocumented immigrants paid \$7 billion a year into Social Security and \$1.5 billion a year into the Medicare systems, again systems that they could not access. Those numbers represented 10% of the gap between what was collected in payroll taxes and the amount that was doled out in benefits to Social Security and Medicare recipients.

Ms. Maxwell stated that when they talked about rescinding the resolution did not mean that they were supporting the 287G program was not the message that the community was receiving. When they were supporting 287G she believed what they were supporting was broken families. When they looked at immigrant families in the United States, 75% of children in mixed immigrant status families were U.S. citizens. That was important because when they thought about what the 287G program did which was to deport people for minor traffic violations, they were deporting the parents of those U.S. citizen children. One thing they had talked about was how the 287G program had failed to do what it was meant to do, which was to protect their communities from serious felons. Instead, a May 2008 study found that 83% of charges resulting from 287G in North Carolina were for traffic violations. So, they were talking about deporting immigrant mothers and fathers for traffic violations.

Ms. Maxwell stated it was important to keep in mind that the Department of Homeland Security, Office of the Inspector General, stated in a report quoted tonight that 287G had failed to provide adequate guidance and supervision for enforcement agents and had failed to consistently weight civil rights and civil liberties in the application of 287G, and had failed to focus on non-citizens who posed a threat to public safety.

Commissioner Stewart asked for the source of Ms. Maxwell's data. Ms. Maxwell stated those figures had come from a New York Times article

Mary Millard, 181 Powers Country Lane, Bennett, NC, presented written comments as follows:

"The new Commissioners have had 2 public meetings, 2 Town Hall meetings, and the budget has been online on the County site and on Commissioner Bock's site since January. They also have asked for and received input from County departments. There has been ample time to review the budget and email input to the Commissioners. Keep in mind the budget is not set in stone. It will be tweaked and altered as the State sends us their budget.

The majority voted the new Commissioners in last November with full knowledge of their budget intentions and is letting our representatives speak for us as that is how the process in this Country works. We appreciate the streamlined process without months of meetings."

Hernan Sedda, Executive Director of the Hispanic Liaison of Chatham County, presented written comments as follows:

"I appreciate the opportunity the Board of Commissioners has given me to express my opinion regarding the proposed Resolution, whose purpose is to change or eliminate the Resolution issued by the same Board in January 2009, which then had pronounced itself against the Chatham County signing of the Memorandum of Agreement-MOA)-287(g), through which authority is given to the police of the local or county signatories of the agreement to assume the functions of immigration and customs enforcement agents (ICE) to investigate the migratory status of persons detained for felonies or more serious criminal transgressions.

I am not going to directly refer to the failure that 287 (g) has represented in the cities where it has been implemented. Three hours, or even three days would not be enough to express the failure in economic matters due to the high costs incurred by the cities or counties, and which were not budgeted; the failure in civil rights matters because, under the pretext of reducing illegal immigration, the basic rights held in our constitution have been bypassed; the failure in social matters, because this implementation has separated resident families, with no regard for the situation of their (American citizen) children, who are left vulnerable and unprotected, with traumas or other problems that are more serious and culminate in an additional burden for the State; and, also, the failure in the migratory matter, because it has not contributed to the reduction of illegal immigration in the United States, which was its principal objective.

I also do not wish to refer to the benefits that the great influx of immigrants has represented for the United States; in fact, it is a nation of immigrants.

But to talk about these things is not why I have come here today. I am here to talk about Chatham County and its residents; about what my experience indicates regarding the community of immigrants in an organization that makes an effort to construct cultural bridges among Hispanics and the other county residents.

I am here to speak out for that 12.5% of the Chatham County residents who are Hispanics and, more specifically, for that 50.9% of the Siler City residents who are Hispanics according to the most recent Census Bureau data update, for the sole and simple reason that they are the people for whom I get up to work every day, and for whom our donors put up their resources to contribute to our programs.

That is the most vulnerable but numerous segment of the population that you also represent, the majority of them young people, and of that young majority, most have been born right here in North Carolina some of whom make up part of our programs.

Those young people come from mixed families, have foreign parents, and some of their siblings have been born here, some not. Many of them are American citizens. They are subjected to great pressures daily, some of their parents are unemployed or have recurring concerns, among them are if they will be able to continue their college education... if their siblings will be allowed to continue.

We also tend to residents from other counties; some young folks have come into our office in tears because the mothers have been stopped by the police for a minor traffic violation while they were all in the car with her, and she was taken away in their presence...in those counties 287g is in force...and what the kids want is our help to find the mother because they don't know what center she has been taken to.

These are daily tragedies lived by American citizens who have been separated from their parents, who, incidentally, were working folks - not criminals. 287g is supposed to be applied to people who commit crimes, not to them! But there has been abuse in its application.

Chatham County is a special place; we have a very strong bicultural foundation which, if well managed, could contribute to the development and achievement of the county's vision and objectives. It is an opportunity; why risk this by rescinding a resolution which has been in force since 2009, and which, at the time, had been analyzed and justified? Why place more pressure on these families?

I don't consider Chatham to be a sanctuary where criminals are protected; I believe that it is a county consisting of intelligent folks who have accepted the working immigrants who help and contribute to the country's growth. One just has to go for a drive down 64 and see people working in trades, and others who are buying. One does not have to wait for the official results of the census to analyze our situation.

I ask you, in the name of these mixed families, who are many, that the 2009 Resolution not be rescinded or changed; to the contrary, it would be good to analyze the development of a resolution that invites our senators to promote a just and accessible migratory law. Not doing so only confirms that, we are fundamentally faced with a problem of lack of political will."

Kathryn Butler, 404 Wooded Lake Drive, Apex, NC, presented written comments as follows:

"The citizens of Chatham County appreciate Ms. Kost's intelligence, service and her commitment to the post of commissioner. However, her urging of people to support her position of lack of input to the budget process rings very hollow and requires a very short memory as I will illustrate shortly.

The current Commissioners scheduled two public hearings, one in Pittsboro and one in Siler City and had NO restrictions on the number of speakers. Everyone attending who wanted to speak was allowed to be heard. Some changes in the budget were made, based on that input, before the final approval and the final approval resulted in the county spending less money with no increase in taxes. The logic in this economy of people clamoring to spend more of the county funds is very odd. I would have expected a reduction in expenses to have been met with universal approval.

As I said, Ms. Kost's position requires a very short memory. Earlier in the year, there was a presentation during a commissioners meeting from the staff member working with the watershed requirements for the county and for Jordan Lake. Some of the commissioners were still asking questions to fully understand the five recommendations, but Ms. Kost quickly made a motion for the option she supported and called for an immediate vote since it was a matter she favored. In that case, not even the entire body of commissioners had a chance to provide input or clarify the details. She railroaded the matter through.

In the case of the rescinding of the ICE resolution (which is not really an ICE resolution), the members of the committee which put the original resolution forward to the commissioners this January have been documented going to adjacent counties to explain how they were able to foster this resolution "**under the radar**" and get it passed in Chatham County. Again, the claim for open input seems hollow since the whole intent was to keep it away from the public scrutiny by not having it available for review in a timely fashion. Rescinding that resolution does nothing but return us to the position of adhering to the laws as written and neither inappropriately targets nor protects anyone.

The real problem is not the lack of public hearing. The real problem is that many voters have spoken for a change in the less than open practices and "stacked" agenda practiced by the previous commissioners. When these Democratic commissioners were mounting all the

initiatives and using their majority, they were satisfied with the results. However, when there are opposing initiatives which also have supporters, and those previous agendas have changed, they cry "foul."

These newly elected commissioners have gone out of their way to be public, to discuss the rationale behind their decisions in the most public of forums-- on line--, and to be open to input both personally and at the meetings. Masking dissatisfaction with votes that do not "go your way" is not lack of openness--it is just that there are opposing citizen opinions which have merit and the newly elected commissioners feel they were elected to implement a different direction for the County. The situation reminds me of a phrase used by my mother from time to time..."You can dish it out, but you can't take it." Not getting your way all the time does not mean that practices are unfair, just that there are other opinions that exist in our elective process."

Deepa Sanyal, of 319 Fearington Post, Pittsboro, NC, presented written comments as follows:

"Daniel Burnham, architect of the Chicago Plan, is quoted as having said: **Make no small plans, they have no magic to stir men's blood and probably will not themselves be realized.** The concept behind this quote is for leaders to think big and plan holistically, for the present, the future and for multiple entities – community, environment, economy.

The proposals to eliminate and downgrade vital environmental protections in Chatham County are a **dissonance of small decisions** that will lead to the degradation and fragmentation of common pool amenities - landscapes, water - important to residents, visitors and the industry clusters that Chatham County wants to attract. These are, as per the EDC's Strategic Plan

- Architecture and engineering services
- Technical and research services
- Basic health services
- Pharmaceutical
- Information services
- Higher education
- Hospitals
- Renewable energies.

These 21st century industry sectors have a stake in environmentally safe and healthy communities and will make location decisions based on the community's commitment to and investment in environmental protection and wise land use decisions. So much of public policy is about signaling our intentions to the larger world. I ask that you re-align your vision for Chatham County in keeping with its key assets, core values and economic development plans. Send out the right signals that will bring prosperity to Chatham County."

James Westmoreland presented written comments as follows:

"Please leave the Environmental Review Board intact and do not transfer the responsibilities of the Watershed Review Board to the Planning Board, which has less expertise for the relevant environmental issues. Since the ERB is composed of non-paid volunteers, it doesn't cost Chatham taxpayers for their advisory services. We need them."

Dan Sundberg presented written comments as follows:

"I have been observing the actions and budget process of Robert Logan and the Board of Education since February of this year and I have specific concerns. All center around facts that are often not disclosed and misleading statements that have been made. These are recent examples:

Central Office vs Central Services

- Deb McManus said the BOE cut 15.5 "central office" positions at the June 1st meeting. Actually, the BOE cut just 8.58 central office positions. The other 7 were central services, (mechanics, psychologists and maintenance etc.)

- Robert Logan said there are 54 central office positions. When I printed a list from Susan Little, it that showed 92 positions. Saying that central office includes 54 positions when trying to keep positions and 92 positions, (Central office and central services), when showing how many are being cut is simply dishonest. These 54 positions do not include the senior network and system administrator position being refilled, making a total of 55 people, with a net cut 7.58 people.

School Reconfiguration Savings

Earlier this year, Mr. Logan had said school reconfiguration would save \$511,000.00. Later, he surprised the BOE by admitting that the cost to retrofit Bonlee would be \$6-10 million. At the most recent BOC/BOE budget meeting on June 1, Commissioner Kost asked if the reconfiguration of the schools would have saved money. Deb McManus responded affirmatively. She had completely overlooked the \$6-10 million renovation costs and the costs for additional bus riders associated with this ill-conceived, poorly-communicated, and inappropriate proposal.

Additional Funding

The \$500,000.00 additional funds requested by the BOE was designed to keep the current per pupil spending the same because classroom size might have to be increased if cuts are not made elsewhere. This funding has nothing to do with Art, Music, Physical Education, Band, or Career Technical Education being provided to the new 160 students, even though the written BOE budget proposal to you said otherwise. In fact, Mr. Logan added this deficit in a presentation to the BOE at the very last budget meeting at too late a date to suggest more cuts to pay for the increased enrollment. This behavior shows poor fiscal management and unprofessional, potentially unethical behavior.

According to Mr. Logan and Mrs. McManus, "The requested increase is calculated on 160 new students (DPI projected student increase) X \$3,123.08 (calculated local per pupil spending for 2011-2012) for a total of \$500,215.96. Specifically, the additional funding would be used to maintain class size, offer existing specials (art, music, physical education, band, and Career & Technical Education) and would also provide supplies and materials to the additional students. Additionally, the existing level of teacher allocations will make it very difficult for our smallest schools (Bennett, Bonlee, J.S. Waters, and Moncure) to schedule a quality middle school program. Some of this funding could be used to address such needs."

Central Office vs. Programs for Students

Robert Logan added back one central office employee when he learned in mid-April that the retirement fund requirement had been reduced by \$311,000.00. He did not use that savings to restore programs. For example, the four middle school Spanish teacher positions that were cut. He also did not add the 2 more teachers needed to make the program effective. (It would take \$330,00.00 to fill six positions to provide Spanish. They could have added another \$270,000.00 by cutting two more classified central office employees and 1 more central office administrator). For as much talk as there has been about the past three years of budget cuts, this is the first time central office is being cut. The one \$80,000.00 position shown cut from central office in 2010 was refilled. The adding back of the central office employee before restoring programs or teachers is against the stated goal of the BOE and the request by the BOC to make the cuts as far from the classroom as possible and shows where the priorities of this school administration and the BOE lie.

Budget Surplus Skews the Real Picture

In 2009, the BOC agreed to give the school district an extra \$1.1M for the 2010-11 school year for Margaret B Pollard startup costs. In the 3/1/2010 budget presentation, the actual startup cost was \$791,244, a savings of \$308,756. The commissioners let the school district keep that extra money. It has been included in the 2010/11 baseline that is being continued for next year. That is 61% of the cost of the potential increased enrollment.

Next year will be a challenging budget year. I encourage the BOC to insist that the BOE identify alternatives such as furloughs, shortened school calendar, and more cuts to central office in the planning for next year. Additionally, the school board and administration should begin

budgeting as businesses do—starting at zero. The schools should not simply start with whatever allocation they were given in a previous year as their baseline, then add a percentage to it. In this economic climate, that is a sure recipe for disaster.

Joan Walsh presented written comments as follows:

“I encourage you to carefully scrutinize at an early date the proposals from the school board as you do with the other departments. Cut the fat, keep academics at a high level, improve the dropout rate, and eliminate duplication, and wasteful management.”

Thank you, Commissioners and County staff. Our federal immigration system is severely broken. Impoverished people who cannot feed their families in other lands come here in order to survive, as has been the case throughout our history. My own great-grandparents came here during the Irish famine of the mid-19th century, and I’m sure many of you here have similar histories. In those days, there were no restrictions on immigration other than known communicable disease or criminal record. Unfortunately, that’s changed drastically since the middle of the 20th century.

The vast majority of modern immigrants have no criminal record or communicable disease. What they do have is tremendous energy and determination to work hard to make it possible for themselves and their families to live with hope and dignity. The problem is they cannot obtain legal documentation under our broken system. For nearly all of today’s immigrants, obtaining documentation takes a minimum of 15 years. I recently read a publication from the US Chamber of Commerce on myths and facts about immigrants, and I have a copy I can share with you. Just a few facts:

1. Immigrants do not compete for jobs with native-born workers. They fill jobs either at the higher or lower end of the education spectrum that are not being filled by natives, or they create their own jobs.
2. Immigrants will replenish the labor force as Baby Boomers – one-quarter of the US population – retire.
3. Nearly all immigrants pay taxes, despite the fact that they cannot access many benefits they pay for, such as social security.
4. Immigration does not increase crime rate – immigrants commit fewer crimes than natives.

Immigrants enrich our communities and our economy. Three years ago, the Chatham County Commissioners led the Triangle in opposition to ICE’s draconian programs, 287(g) and so-called Secure Communities. These programs are supposed to apprehend and deport felons: those guilty of murder, rape, drug smuggling, or other serious crimes, but on fact, most arrests and deportations are of hard-working, law-abiding people, breaking up families and causing untold suffering for children, as well as their parents.

Please continue the leadership shown by previous Chatham Commissioners and reject such programs. The federal government must fix our immigration system, and allow today’s immigrants the same chance for a good life that our immigrant ancestors had. Until that happens, we must not allow local law enforcement resources to be misused. Thank you again for your careful consideration of this issue.”

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Petty moved, seconded by Commissioner Stewart, to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried five (5) to zero (0), and the meeting adjourned at 9:42 PM.

Brian Bock, Chairman

ATTEST:

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