

**MINUTES  
CHATHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS  
WORK SESSION  
AUGUST 15, 2011**

---

The Board of Commissioners (“the Board”) of the County of Chatham, North Carolina met in the Agricultural Building Auditorium, 45 South Street, Pittsboro, North Carolina at 2:30 PM on August 15, 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

*Work Session*

1. **Public Input Session**
2. **Green Building and Sustainable Energy (GBASE) Annual Report**
3. **Recreation Advisory Committee Summary Annual Report**
4. **Briar Chapel Roadway Width Discussion**
5. **Incorporation of Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) into Environmental Review Board (ERB)**
6. **Budget Critique for FY 2011-2012 Budget:** Give staff feedback on improvements to the FY 2012-2013 budget
7. **Closed Session to discuss property acquisition and approval of closed session minutes**

**CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Bock called the meeting to order at 3:03 PM.

**PUBLIC INPUT SESSION**

There was no one present who wished to make public comments.

**GREEN BUILDING AND SUSTAINABLE ENERGY (GBASE) ANNUAL REPORT**

Paul Konove, Chair of the Green Building and Sustainability Energy Advisory Board, explained that the Board of Commissioners has requested that each Advisory Committee submit an annual report. The annual report follows:

## **GBASE Annual Report Presentation to the Board of Commissioners August 15, 2011**

### **1) Short History of GBASE & Membership Introduction:**

From GBTF and request for volunteers. My understanding that the review of applications to determine membership to the board resulted in the choosing of a majority of the board who had a wealth of experience in the green building arena and others who had at least some experience – as opposed to choosing people who simply thought green building was a good idea. Because of this process of choosing volunteers to serve, the majority of the voting membership is made up of people who are small businesses owners and/or work for a small business whose primary work is green building.

#### Our Local Green Business Members based in Chatham County include:

Taylor Hobbs – Hobbs Architect PA  
Adrienne Bashista– Home Performance NC. And energy auditing and weatherization contracting business in Moncure.  
Paul Konove –Carolina Country Builders - designer / builder of new homes / additions / renovations

#### The Small Green Business Members are:

David Boyton – SEM - Director of Product Development and Training  
Jaimie Hager – SEM - Green building programs specialist

#### Other members are:

Laura Lauffer heads up the Sustainability Technology Program at CCCC  
Deepa Sanyal– professional background in Community Revitalization and Regional Planning is a Training and Education Professional – and a sustainability consultant  
Jim Hackney – financial analyst with sustainability responsibilities within his firm.  
Mike Dasher - General Contractor, a LEED Green Associate and an NAHB Certified Green Professional – with experience in affordable housing.  
William Sparrow – lawyer with experience in construction law with an interested in green building issues.

Just as a side note - for volunteers who are working it is sometimes difficult for them to attend afternoon sessions for presentations (as an example my not being able to make the last two afternoon work sessions), so to facilitate working public members on committees input and participation to the Board of Commissioners, I would suggest you enable members to determine the session most appropriate (or at least just allow them to present in evening sessions).

### **1) Report:**

As requested by the Board of Commissioners, we were asked to put together a report of our activities for the last year.

The Green Building and Sustainable Energy Advisory Committee recognizes that:

- The Chatham County Board of Commissioners is committed to supporting energy-efficient and environmentally friendly construction practices throughout Chatham County including Chatham County funded building projects.

- The Board of Commissioners has expressed interest to explore cost effective standards and metrics for achieving the goal of energy for Chatham County funded building projects in order to save energy and maintenance costs.
- In 2007, the US congress passed and President George Bush signed the Energy Independence and Security Act which requires all new federal buildings and major renovations meet the energy performance standard targets of the 2030 Challenge.
- The 2030 Challenge is a broadly accepted energy use target for all new buildings and major renovations.
- Other governmental adopters include: The National Governors Association, The National Association of Counties.
- The 2030 Challenge has been adopted by AIA (the American Institute of Architects), and the American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and is supported by Air-Conditioning Engineers (ASHRAE).
- The Energy Star Target Finder is a no-cost online tool that enables architects and building owners to set energy targets and receive an US EPA Energy Star energy performance score for projects during the design process.
- The State of North Carolina has adopted energy and water metrics for State-owned buildings, The University of North Carolina, and the North Carolina Community College System.
- The North Carolina Gen. Stat. s. 143-135.35 Article 8C. Performance Standards for Sustainable, Energy-Efficient Public Buildings establishes specific performance standards for sustainable, energy-efficient public buildings. This North Carolina statute states: that performance standards should be based upon recognized, consensus standards that are supported by science and have a demonstrated performance record.
- The Green Building and Sustainable Energy Advisory Board believes energy efficiency and water efficiency targets should be adopted for new and existing Chatham County funded building projects whenever they are constructed or renovated.

And, therefore, the Green Building and Sustainable Energy Advisory Board recommends that the Chatham County Board of Commissioners adopt one of the following metrics of energy and water efficiency for all Chatham County Government funded building projects including the Chatham County Jail Project:

Energy Star target finder certification:

- 1) Energy standards as per North Carolina Gen. Stat. s. 143-135.35 Article 8C. Performance Standards for Sustainable, Energy-Efficient Public Buildings
- 2) The 2030 Challenge (appropriate year) level as adopted by the Federal government.

Following the meeting earlier in the year when the Board of Commissioners voted to decide on determining LEED certification on a case by case basis for county buildings, and because there was no discussion/questions on the other certification methodology included in the original Green Building Task Force recommendation for county buildings; the Green Building and Sustainable Energy Advisory Board decided to review and update other energy metrics for energy performance recommendations for county buildings.

As part of our information gathering for this effort, I attended the BOC meeting where the architect presented LEED cost information to the board relating to the new jail

project. The only energy performance / energy savings information I heard from the architect was that the building would be energy efficient. I did not hear from the architect and there was no discussion that I recall relating to what type of above code energy performance features would be included nor did I hear anything about return on investment of these possible strategies. Following the meeting I spoke to the architect outside the meeting room.

I asked him about what type of strategies he might include that might have a 5-10 return on investment that would be of interest to the county. I also asked him the same question for strategies in the 10-15 year and 15-20 year time frame. I was surprised when he did not respond with even one suggestion of an energy efficient strategy that might fit one of those return on investment time frames.

I then asked him how energy efficient was his target for the jail project. Was it to be 1% higher than code I asked – or 15% or 50%. He said he did not know and that he was going to leave these issues to his commissioning agent and his HVAC subcontractor. To say the least I was surprised. A commissioning agent's job is to make sure a project performs to the specifications developed during the design process, it is not to determine specifications. Similarly, an HVAC subcontractor's job typically is to design to code unless specified by the architect or the client to design to a higher standard.

For this reason, I believe it is critical that the board direct its staff to immediately communicate with the project architect of the jail and ask him to provide estimated ROI (return on investment) for incorporating energy performance strategies for each of the GBASE recommendations presented today. I believe this would result in energy savings for the County's budget and as a result would serve the citizens of the county well.

Thank you.

Paul Konove  
[pkonove@greenhomedesignbuild.com](mailto:pkonove@greenhomedesignbuild.com)

Commissioner Petty asked if Mr. Konove was familiar with any of the other agencies that give efficiency certifications other than LEED.

Mr. Konove replied that the RAFI Building was the first Energy Star certified commercial office space in North Carolina. Energy Star Certification includes homes, commercial buildings, and they do have the Energy Star Target Finder for institutional and commercial buildings.

Commissioner Stewart asked Mr. Konove if he would talk about and define the word "green".

Mr. Konove replied that he takes a very big picture of green. He has been involved with solar energy since the late 1970's. He stated that there were basically five areas of green: These five areas are essentially those included in the LEED program - Energy, Materials, Indoor Air Quality, Water, and Site Selection. He stated that when you look at it, everything comes down to energy. For example, at the EDC meeting, a talk was given by Ralph Avallone about business aspects of green. When you look at a product, you start talking about what's called "embodied energy". That is the energy that is involved from when the product or material is originally mined until the end of its life. This would involve all industrial aspects (FYI - meaning mining, production, delivery, use, and disposal). For some of us, the green is that big picture and it impacts (for example) the health services in the County. (How do they use their vehicles? How do the buildings perform?) It involves the Department of Transportation or the different departments within the County. (How do you drive from one place to another efficiently?) There are lots of different levels that green building entails in that big picture.

Commissioner Stewart asked if it was air quality as well. Mr. Konove responded that typically, we are talking about indoor air quality for buildings. In terms of outside air

quality, it relates to transportation costs where buildings are sited (i.e. that there is potentially less driving) that also has an effect on (outdoor) air quality. In a sense, the programs he mentioned, Energy Star Target Finder, 2030 Challenge, and State program legislation deal primarily with energy. The State program is the only one that has a water section to it as energy related to water. Water use has a tremendous impact on energy use in terms of cost of delivering water because of all the pumping that is required.

Commissioner Petty stated that there are several agencies that certify that are comparable to the LEED certification. He asked Mr. Konove if he knew of others.

Mr. Konove stated that one of the ones they talked about is known as the GBI (Green Globes is the actual name of program – It is run The Green Building Initiative -GBI). A number of years ago when the Green Building Task Force originally passed their recommendations, they said you could build to LEED Silver, GBI or any other energy certification program that essentially meets this energy level. The GBI is a program that enables the frontend of the design to give you an idea of where that design is going in terms of energy and other green aspects. It was less expensive, but over the interim of four to five years, the European originated program that has been introduced here has not gained the footing nationally that LEED has. Alicia Ravetto was an advocate at that time because you knew better where you were going during the initial design phase because it was frontend loaded. With LEED, you follow a checklist and are not guided through the design.

Mr. Konove stated that because LEED was determined by the commissioners to be considered on a case by case basis, and because there was now no other specific energy program to follow, that is why they (GBASE) now recommended the three programs, 2030 Challenge which is a program that basically ramps up every five years to get buildings to perform at a higher level. The Energy Target Finder is tied to, in some respects, the 2030 Challenge Program. It might be that the NC Legislative Program is the best one to use. In February they didn't have enough time to go into it but the Wake County Community College mentioned at that meeting was built to that level before it became law. It was probably \$90,000 more or less, but it had a return on investment that was five years and a 14% ROI. All of those costs are good returns on investments.

Commissioner Petty stated that efficiency is the key to success. But you reach a point of diminishing returns if you're not careful. And that's the line that we do not want to cross.

Chairman Bock stated that when we talked to the architect, we talked about incorporating those items within LEED that have a 5-7 year return. He stated that they didn't actually say use Energy Star Target Finder but they did talk about incorporating those things that had a five-year return and he is a little surprised to hear that the architect did not know that. Mr. Konove replied that he was too.

Mr. Konove stated he thought that the jail project was about 80% through the initial design phase (the initial phase is called schematic design - I did not say the name. I was not meaning the entire design process – which may have been what others heard or thought I might be implying by their responses) so these recommendations should be considered soon to have an minimal cost impact on the jail project.

Chairman Bock asked if the County Manager knew where we are on the planning phase since we just found a site last meeting. The County Manager replied that he was not aware of it being that far along. Chairman Bock stated that he thought it would be lower than that unless they anticipated that we were going to select that site.

The County Manager as noted, the site was selected at the last meeting. We are designing the facility based on the site so he has never heard 80%.

Mr. Konove stated that what he heard was through a conversation between Taylor Hobbs and David Hughes that it might be that percentage. He does not know if that is in fact the case. In terms of GBTF, the GBASE board (and now the new committee) knowing how to figure out where to go, they have said all along that where it is now. It really needs to be

integrated into staff's background, and experience and knowledge at some level because they need to be the ones to make educated decisions. Somebody needs to get up-to-speed on these kinds of certification programs so that they can make knowledgeable decisions to then recommend to the Board of Commissioners as to what to do.

Chairman Bock stated that he liked the idea of bringing up these other certifications rather than just LEED as he felt that they did focus too much on LEED. The idea was to incorporate those energy efficient things that had a demonstrable return over a 5-7 year period without actually getting the certificate. He doesn't think that has changed. And he thinks that is the charge that the architect has at this point. The County Manager replied that was correct.

Chairman Bock stated that we needed to make sure that the architect has the message.

Mr. Konove stated that these programs do not deal essentially with indoor air quality. You could still have bad materials inside to cause problems because one is dealing with energy and one is dealing with water. There are still other issues in order to build a really nice building, and LEED is the only one encompassing all those areas.

Commissioner Stewart stated, to that point, Mr. Konove talked about the LEED certification is guaranteeing that one is following the best standards, getting the best air quality, and building materials, etc. She referred to the library air quality asking what happened there. What happens if it fails to actually do what LEED certification says it will do?

Mr. Konove stated that nothing was perfect, but the LEED program and the others mentioned are at a point where everyone is trying to improve how we build. Briar Chapel is a good case-in-point. There used to be training activities in the County where the local chapter of the homebuilders learned about green issues. He stated that he was invited to a regional meeting held in Fearrington Village where he presented to local marketers, regional director and the local people who were running the effort on Briar Chapel. He talked with them about all the different programs that are available. They have moved on making the choice of building green. Those programs have evolved over time from approximately seven years ago. All of the programs keep changing and trying to improve. It is almost like we are starting from nothing from the mid-nineties. Some aspects of the programs don't work. Some of the buildings come out poorly or have to get fixed, but they are trying to improve because the building community doesn't have the infrastructure for bringing new methods in like the health or agriculture community does to make changes and improve over time.

The Board thanked Mr. Konove for his presentation.

## **RECREATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE SUMMARY ANNUAL REPORT**

Joe Fraser, Parks and Recreation Chairman, and Tracy Burnett, Chatham County Recreation Director, presented the Recreation Advisory Committee Summary Annual Report as follows:

### **Recreation Advisory Committee Summary Annual Report Accomplishments and Activities**

#### **History:**

Just six years ago, Chatham County Parks & Recreation had ONE County park: the baseball field at Bynum on 23 acres. Chatham County now has NINE facilities totaling 425 acres and 4.6 miles along the American Tobacco Trail.

**Current Park Facilities:**

**Earl Thompson Neighborhood Park (Bynum):** Is the first park developed by the County. It is a 23 acre parcel with only 6 acres developed. At this park, there is a softball field, playground, parking, and concession with restroom.

**Southwest Park (Bear Creek):** Is a 25 acre park built in 2005. Chatham County received \$250,000 from NCPARTF for this park. It includes a multipurpose field, playground, parking, picnic shelter with kitchen and restroom and a walking trail.

**Northwest Park (near Silk Hope):** In November 2007, the County acquired this 118 acres property that used to be Camp Maranatha Springs. In the past two years, the County has made several improvements, including adding playground equipment, picnic shelter, paddles boats, new well and septic systems, restroom addition, new roofing and opened the only county-owned swimming pool. Summer camp is offered at the park.

**Northeast Park (Big Woods Road near Jordan Lake):** This is a \$3.4 million dollar facility on 66 acres nearing completion that we completed for only \$1.2 (construction only)/\$2.6 million (construction and land) in County funds for facilities. It includes a baseball field, tennis courts, walking trails, multi-purpose field, restrooms and concession stand, playground and picnic shelter. We purchased the property for \$1.4 million using the park exaction fee paid by builders. The park's grand opening is slated for August 19. The County provided \$1.2 million to match a \$500,000 grant from PARTF. Additional funds included \$208,000 from the Clean Water Management Trust, and \$130,000 combined from The Arthur Carlsen Fund (a part of the Triangle Community Foundation) and Carolina Meadows (which is paying \$10,000 per year for the next 5 years).

**Briar Chapel Park: (Andrews Store Road):** Is in a residential development with a portion of their land developed into a park. This 62 acre park includes 2 softball/baseball fields, soccer field and football field. There was no land cost to the County. Improvements for the park are through the recreation fees paid by Briar Chapel.

**American Tobacco Trail (Northeastern Chatham):** The trail runs 22 miles along an old railroad bed connecting Wake, Durham and Chatham Counties. There are 4.6 miles of trail that run through Chatham County.

**Bynum Beach Canoe Access:** Is a one-acre site. Funds were raised by the Carolina Canoe Club to allow for developing and maintaining this site.

**15/501 Canoe Access:** The County maintains the parking lot at this property.

**Strowd Park (Crawford-Dairy Road):** There are 130 acres in North Chatham (undeveloped). The land was purchased with recreation exaction fee.

**Parks & Recreation Master Plan:** In 2009, the growth in approved home sites in the County prompted the department to update our ten-year Master Plan for Parks. We had not done so in nearly ten years. To monitor the firm hired to develop the new Master Plan, we formed the POG (Project Oversight Group) comprised of representative from all recreational disciplines and related entities, including the North Carolina Wildlife Resource Commission, North Carolina State Trails, Chatham Planning Department, Environmental Review Board, Chairman of the Board of Commissioners, Pittsboro Town Manager, Chatham Soccer League, Board of Education, Haw River Assembly, Chatham Conservation Partnership and the East Chatham Football League. We also had staff members from County recreation and Pittsboro recreation.

**Accomplishments by the Recreation Advisory Committee Parks:**

**Purchased Northeast Park (NE) land September 2007.** Completed August, 2011. The Advisory Committee walked the property with some Board of Commissioner members and recommended the purchase of the land.

**Completed American Tobacco Trail jointly with Cary November, 2009.** Parks and Recreation Director with County Management developed an agreement with Cary about the American Tobacco Trail. The Recreation Advisory Committee provided input into the type of trail surface needed for this project.

**Acquired ownership of Briar Chapel Park (coming soon)** – Parks and Recreation Director and athletic associations organizations had discussions with the developer about the interest and need in the athletic fields. Parks and Recreation Director and the Advisory Committee walked the property and recommended to the County Manager that the County assume ownership of the property.

**Programs:**

Moved summer camp to NW Park which allowed us to accommodate 75 campers full-day 2010. The Recreation Advisory Committee supported the recreation staff's recommendation to ask for additional staff in order to accommodate more campers.

**Policy:**

- 1999- Worked with a consultant to develop the 1999 parks and recreation master plan
- 2009- Worked with a consultant to update the 1999 master plan,
- 2009- Establish designated smoking area policy in parks
- 2010 - Revised the application process for county grants given to towns to a program-based application for towns
- 2010- Established facility reservation fees
- 2011 - Developed and presented the Parks and Recreation Community Service Award
- 2011 - Established the County Primary Youth Sport Provider Policy

**Partners:**

There are other partners that we consistently work with to provide events and programs, such as the YMCA, Active Chatham, Town of Siler City, Town of Pittsboro, Sheriff's Department, Cooperative Extension's 4-H Youth Development, Cooperative Extension's Consumer Food Services, the Council on Aging, various sports leagues, and Special Olympics.

Commissioner Stewart asked what the plans were for the Strowd Property.

Ms. Burnett explained that the land was purchased in a "land banking" opportunity and she is unsure of the plans at this time.

Commissioner Cross asked how much the County paid per acre for the land. Ms. Burnett stated that she did not recall the per acre amount.

The County Manager stated that there were forty acres contributed if the County purchased the other part of it. Ms. Burnett concurred stating that there were forty acres donated and the County purchased the other eighty acres. The County Manager stated that there are currently no plans for the site.

Chairman Bock asked if the Recreation Advisory Committee was involved in the purchase recommendation. Ms. Burnett stated that they talked about it at some of their meetings. They didn't get a chance to walk that property; that Debra Henzey and she looked at it more at that time when they were searching for a northeast site. The landowner contacted the Board of Education who then contacted the Recreation Department as they

were not interested in it at that time. They pursued it further with regard to the soils, type of terrain, etc.; that in the same time, the property on Big Woods Road became available; that that property was seen as a more feasible area in which to put a park; and that the landowner returned with the offer to donate land with the purchase of land; and that from that point, it went into a "land banking" opportunity.

Chairman Bock asked if that was part of the Parks Master Plan. Ms. Burnett stated that it was mentioned in the Master Plan as a proposed park site.

Commissioner Stewart asked if there were criteria followed with regard to "land banking". Ms. Burnett explained that they tried to use the Master Plan as guidance to search for different land. As land became available and it was mentioned to anyone serving on the Board of Commissioners or Board of Education, they would get together and discuss whether it was part of the Master Plan and get County management involved at that time. She stated that a lot of offers were turned down that came before the group.

Commissioner Cross stated that some of the criteria was looking to provide parks for each area of the County and where possible, school sites could be combined with parks to share ball fields, saving the costs of building them for schools.

Commissioner Stewart stated that she assumed density and future building plays a part in that also. Ms. Burnett stated that at that time, whatever came to the table was discussed and if it was close to other County land and the topography of it. She stated that the Strowd Land was the only land that was "land banked".

The County Manager stated that was the only parcel that we hold that, other than the Recreation Master Plan, is not planned for a school site. The reason for its selection was the potential for having multi-use out of it.

Commissioner Petty asked if it is something that still needs to be considered.

Commissioner Kost stated that there was still a potential school site on the property and it is within the area that is the zone of where the Board of Commissioners has said the next elementary school needs to be.

Chairman Bock stated that he thought there needed to be something on the east side of the lake. Commissioner Kost stated, no, not according to discussions with the Board of Education. She asked if the contract for the lighting at Briar Chapel had been awarded and asked if we had taken ownership of the property and if there was a reason.

The County Manager stated that was correct and it needs to be discussed with the County Attorney.

### **BRIAR CHAPEL ROADWAY WIDTH DISCUSSION**

Nick Robinson, Attorney, thanked the Board for allowing them to bring this issue before the Board.

By way of background, this project was approved under the Compact Communities Ordinance ("CCO") which specifically recommended usage of the *NCDOT Traditional Neighborhood Development Street Guidelines* (the "TND Standards"). However, we understand that the project was denied as a TND by the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) due the guidelines being intended to apply to neighborhoods and subdivisions that were 125 acres or less. Given that Briar Chapel was not approved to utilize those standards, the project team, in conjunction with the District Office, has developed a hybrid set of standards, the Internal Street Guidelines. This document represents the design standards that were used to create the first 627 lots and roadways which have been approved by NCDOT, approximately 25% of the development. We want it to be clear that the County supports these Internal Street Guidelines, and finds them consistent with the intent and approvals for Briar Chapel.

He stated that the NCDOT hybrid standards will function for the rest of the subdivision, but the DOT's principle concern at the end was to make sure that in agreeing to the hybrid standards, they didn't somehow get "crosswise" with the County. He asked the Board of Commissioners for a letter from either the County Manager or the Board of Commissioners to the NCDOT Highway State Administrator confirming that the County supports the hybrid design standards so that the NCDOT is then free to approve it.

Commissioner Kost asked if there was a recommendation from the Planning Department.

The County Manager explained that staff, by Subdivision Standards, for twenty years has said by "NCDOT Standards". The State was unsure of the County's position with the new hybrid standard. The County's role has been to pursue whatever the Board of Commissioners approves. He stated that staff does not have a recommendation other than he has met with NCDOT last Friday and DOT has said that if the Board approves it, the Planning staff will enforce their approval.

Commissioner Kost stated that there was a reason for the standards. She stated that she is uncomfortable saying that they approve standards if the staff doesn't give approval from a technical standpoint. In the letter, the attorney outlines a couple of things: 1) road width; 2) parking on the streets. She stated that she would want to know from the County Transportation Planner if she supports all of the changes, not from a policy standard but the reason why the standards are in place to begin with.

Commissioner Stewart asked if there was a reason they wouldn't want to follow NCDOT standards.

Commissioner Kost stated that she thinks what they are saying is that there is.

Chairman Bock stated that the hybrid gets it closer to what the County originally approved by it being a compact community. The problem is, Briar Chapel is larger than the compact community roadways. If you go strictly by NCDOT standards or the very wide roads, it is not the original intent to Briar Chapel. The hybrid is a combination of the two things.

Commissioner Kost stated that she understood all that. The question, she asked, is what else is in there? She stated that she would be more comfortable if staff had gone through the new standards and raised any concerns, not on a policy level, but for the reasons behind them (i.e. deleting all the sidewalks).

Mr. Robinson stated that they were obligated to do those types of things under the conditional use permit anyway. Commissioner Kost stated that she could agree to support the letter based on a review by the Transportation Planner to make sure there are no concerns there.

Mr. Robinson responded that that creates a "catch 22". Staff has expressed to them that they do not want a direct reference to the staff approving the standards because they say that the Subdivision Ordinance says that they refer to the North Carolina Department of Transportation with regard to roadway standards. If the rule is that the staff has no input, they accept the NCDOT permit from them as part of the land planning process, then it has to be the rule. If that is the rule, then all DOT wants to know is to confirm that rule and that is what the letter does.

Commissioner Kost stated that she was asking them to go one step further and make sure there is no technical issue with any of the standards that are in new hybrid edition.

Commissioner Stewart stated that it would not be their call to change them. Commissioner Kost stated that is what she thought they were doing. Commissioner Stewart stated that she feels the problem they have gotten into is imposing other things into something where there is an agency such as the DOT that regulates this type of thing.

Commissioner Kost stated that she thought they were going away from the normal DOT standards.

Mr. Robinson stated that they were not going away from the normal DOT standards except to the extent the DOT approves of it, and they do. This is the agreement that the DOT has put forward to them saying that this is what they have to do. They want the County to say that they agree that they will defer to the DOT.

Commissioner Petty asked if we had accepted DOT's guidelines in every situation in the past.

Richard Adams, Briar Chapel Traffic Engineer, stated that this document has been reviewed thoroughly for months by DOT from the District Engineer to the State Highway Administrator and back. It will be the rule of law from DOT in every way. They now believe that it will be adopted as is. Any tweaks that they require will be incorporated. They specifically wanted to know that the County was okay with these documents which are essentially a hybrid between the two DOT standards.

Commissioner Petty stated that if we had accepted DOT standards in the past, he could not understand why we would question it now.

Commissioner Cross stated that we are really talking about the TND regulations that were placed on Briar Chapel and should not have been.

Mr. Adams stated that according to the DOT definition of the TND, there have been no developments approved in North Carolina as a TND in the eleven years that they have had the guidelines because of these similar arbitrary requirements. The Compact Community Ordinance did specify TND guidelines, which was the intent, and this is a compact community which is the intent of the TND guidelines. It just didn't fit their particular cap that they had placed in the text.

Chairman Bock stated that if they didn't like the hybrid, then you have to go back to the wider roads, which is the other standard. If there is no hybrid, you have to either go to the compact community which is where you started and they have said no to, or you go to the wider roads. He stated to him, it was that simple. There are two set standards. They are willing to compromise. And the DOT wants to make sure that the Board of Commissioners is agreeable to that.

Commissioner Kost stated that this is more than just road width asking if there weren't other things in there.

Mr. Adams stated it was all roadway geometry. It is road width, curb radii, and some design guidelines which the DOT has reviewed and is going to sign-off on them. It will be approved DOT requirements.

Commissioner Kost stated that all she is asking is that, because the County does have a Transportation Planner who is an expert in this field, why we are not having her review this and provide the Board comments.

The County Manager replied that in January, the Planning Department Staff did look at it. Ms. Guilbeau was part of the review. We responded to DOT that we did not have comments because we did not have the expertise in those particular facets.

Commissioner Kost asked if the Transportation Planner did not have the expertise to address road widths and turn radii, etc. Chairman Bock replied that was what DOT does.

Commissioner Petty moved, seconded by Commissioner Cross, to approve the letter from either the County Manager or the Board of Commissioners to the NCDOT Highway State Administrator confirming that the County supports the hybrid design standards so that the NCDOT is then free to approve it.

The County Manager stated that if that letter was accepted, he would want other wording in it saying that the Board has approved the design. He stated that the letter states that he clarifies the ambiguity and what is really happening is that the Board is saying to DOT that the hybrid standards are good with us. If the Chairman signs the letter, the letter would be okay as written. Chairman Bock stated that he was willing to sign the letter.

Mr. Robinson stated that the letter would be revised for the Chairman's signature rather than the County Manager. The County Manager stated that was fine as long as it was clarified that it was a Board activity.

Commissioner Kost stated that she was going to vote for the motion as she supports what they are trying to do, but asked to go on record stating that she is very uncomfortable being asked to vote for something that they have not really seen which are the street guidelines. She stated that other than road width and parking on the streets, they have not discussed the specifics that are in there.

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

### **INCORPORATION OF SOLID WASTE ADVISORY COMMITTEE (SWAC) INTO ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW BOARD (ERB)**

Dan LaMontagne, Environmental Quality Director, stated that due to the common goal of environmental protection demonstrated by those that would serve on either the Solid Waste Advisory Committee (SWAC) or the Environmental Review Board (Environmental Review Board), he is proposing that SWAC be incorporated into the ERB and that the members of the combined committee be chosen to represent the opinions of the residents in the different areas of the County. He stated that this would help the County staff receive input on how various issues and programs related to environmental policy would be viewed and accepted by county residents.

The make-up of the combined committee could consist of two appointments per member of the Board of Commissioners chosen to represent the community where they reside (possibly by Board of Commissioners' district). The overall committee could then appoint a subcommittee that would work on issues related to solid waste and recycling as needed and would report back to the full committee. This committee make-up would provide for a sampling of the County as a whole that would advise County staff of the opinions and concerns of the general population.

Commissioner Kost stated that she thought the landfill process was working very well from citizens' input and advisory boards. There was the Solid Waste Advisory Committee and the Environmental Review Board. They each bring different skill sets. She thought that it worked well having the two advisory committees. She stated that she sees them as two distinct functions and is having a hard time understanding how this is going to work.

Mr. LaMontagne stated with regard to that specific example, they were working as the Solid Waste Advisory Committee and presenting back to the Environmental Review Board receiving comments and then taking that back. He stated that he saw it as an efficiency for a situation like that that they worked together from the onset.

Commissioner Kost stated that they could have had a joint meeting. Mr. LaMontagne concurred.

Commissioner Petty stated it was all environmental issues.

Commissioner Kost stated that not all the solid waste issues are environmental issues.

Mr. LaMontagne stated that if it was a water quality issue and a new policy coming forth, he sees value in having members of that committee who are not directly involved with water quality. They would give that objective opinion of how the rest of the County would

view it. A lot of times when we are in these advisory committees, working on programs or policies, you are so close to it that you are committed and very involved.

Commissioner Stewart stated that by having some input from the beginning from another objective point-of-view, you might be able to see things that you wouldn't ordinarily see.

Mr. LaMontagne stated that that is where he sees the value of the subcommittee in reporting back to a larger committee that has a range throughout the County. They are so close to it, that once they come back, they can get early input without taking it further.

Commissioner Kost stated that the makeup of the Environmental Review Board is very specific. It talks about the needs for different areas, mainly science, to be represented. She asked if Mr. LaMontagne was seeing those requirements for the Environmental Review Board to stay the same, stating that she is looking for a very sound, technical board.

Mr. LaMontagne stated that he didn't see that they would need to, but it is up for discussion.

Commissioner Petty asked if each Commissioner would appoint two members, possibly from their district. Mr. LaMontagne replied that was the current makeup of the Environmental Review Board.

Commissioner Petty asked then if other advisory committees would be formed of the members of that group. Mr. LaMontagne stated that depending on the topics, we have a number of different groups that have expertise around the County, but his first thought was to be within the original committee.

Commissioner Petty stated that he would say a committee member with possibly additional input from other people of different districts.

Commissioner Stewart stated that it would depend on the topic, based on the particular topic, the project, or objective. Mr. LaMontagne stated that if a topic impacts a certain area of the County, it would be nice to get with community groups in that area with a representative.

Commissioner Kost asked if he was asking for a decision today or if it would be referred to each of the subcommittees for their input since they know more about what they do on a month-by-month basis. She stated that she had attended a lot of the Environmental Review Board meetings and a handful of Solid Waste Advisory Committee meetings, but she would think we would need their input before a final call was made.

Mr. LaMontagne stated that he spoke with the chairman of the SWAC, John McSween, and he saw it as a fantastic idea. He saw the similarities with the landfill project and he has worked with a number of the members.

Commissioner Kost stated that she would like to hear from the entire committee and that she would also like to hear from the Environmental Review Board.

Commissioner Cross asked Mr. LaMontagne to go to both committees, advise them that the Board of Commissioners has some interest in considering consolidating, let the boards meet together, and figure out how it would best work, if it will work, or why it will not work.

By consensus, the Board agreed.

#### **BUDGET CRITIQUE FOR FY 2011-2012 BUDGET**

Renee Paschal, Assistant County Manager, explained that staff is beginning to start the budget process for next year as follows:

Each year following completion of the budget, commissioners give staff feedback on how the process or document could be improved. Last year, Commissioners identified the following issues to address during the critique:

1. Sufficient time should be set aside during the retreat for Commissioners to discuss and adopt their goals.
2. The budget document should include a summary of all departments and their budgets, including prior year information.
3. Commissioners gave staff the option of removing the explanation of one-time expenses.
4. The Heads-Up document should be standardized and made more succinct. The nonprofit process should be streamlined.

Item 1: The retreat agenda was based on input from the chair and vice chair. Commissioners did discuss general goals, but no final goals were adopted.

Item 2: A summary of department funding, including prior years, was included on pages 23-25 of the budget document.

Item 3: Staff opted not to remove one-time expenses, as this proved helpful in comparing budgets between fiscal years and determining whether reduction targets were met.

Item 4: Staff did streamline and standardize the Heads Up document. See the attachment.

Item 5: After review by staff and direction from commissioners, changes were made to the nonprofit process to provide better coordination with county departments and reduce reliance on the county for administrative expenses. These changes result in additional staff work.

Commissioners adopted the following calendar for preparation of the FY 2011-2012 budget:

<b>Deadline</b>	<b>Actions</b>
20 December 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manager submits recommended CIP to the Board of Commissioners</li> </ul>
18 January 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hold public hearing on the proposed CIP</li> </ul>
21 January 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget summit materials (survey results, financial trends, and departmental “Heads Up” document) submitted to Board of Commissioners</li> <li>• Work plan and new position forms distributed to departments</li> </ul>
January 31, February 1 and 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget Summit: Board of Commissioners sets goals and guidelines for FY 2012 budget; Commissioners adopt CIP</li> </ul>
14 February 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget kickoff meeting</li> </ul>
16 March 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budgets due from departments and agencies</li> </ul>
16 May 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget submitted to Board of Commissioners and public</li> </ul>
May 23 and 24, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Official public hearings held in Pittsboro and Siler City</li> </ul>
1 June, 2 June, 6 June, 7 June	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Board of Commissioners holds budget work sessions</li> </ul>
By 30 June 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Board of Commissioners adopts budget (legal deadline)</li> </ul>

In addition to the dates above, staff met one-on-one with commissioners to review the recommended budget immediately prior to submission.

Although commissioners voted to eliminate submission of the document for GFOA review (at an expense of \$550), the document still meets GFOA requirements.

Finally, commissioners have asked that staff produce a seven-year Capital Improvements Program for FY 2013-2019.

Item 1: The retreat agenda was based on input from the chair and vice chair. Commissioners did discuss general goals, but no final goals were adopted.

Item 2: A summary of department funding, including prior years, was included on pages 23-25 of the budget document.

Item 3: Staff opted not to remove one-time expenses, as this proved helpful in comparing budgets between fiscal years and determining whether reduction targets were met.

Item 4: Staff did streamline and standardize the Heads-Up document.

Item 5: After review by staff and direction from Commissioners, changes were made to the nonprofit process to provide better coordination with County departments and reduce reliance on the County for administrative expenses. These changes result in additional staff work.

Commissioners adopted the following calendar for preparation of the FY 2011-2012 budget:

<b>Deadline</b>	<b>Actions</b>
20 December 2010	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Manager submits recommended CIP to the Board of Commissioners</li> </ul>
18 January 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hold public hearing on the proposed CIP</li> </ul>
21 January 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget summit materials (survey results, financial trends, and departmental “Heads Up” document) submitted to Board of Commissioners</li> <li>• Work plan and new position forms distributed to departments</li> </ul>
January 31, February 1 and 8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget Summit: Board of Commissioners sets goals and guidelines for FY 2012 budget; Commissioners adopt CIP</li> </ul>
14 February 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget kickoff meeting</li> </ul>
16 March 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budgets due from departments and agencies</li> </ul>
16 May 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Budget submitted to Board of Commissioners and public</li> </ul>
May 23 and 24, 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Official public hearings held in Pittsboro and Siler City</li> </ul>
1 June, 2 June, 6 June, 7 June	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Board of Commissioners holds budget work sessions</li> </ul>
By 30 June 2011	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Board of Commissioners adopts budget (legal deadline)</li> </ul>

In addition to the dates above, staff met one-on-one with commissioners to review the recommended budget immediately prior to submission.

Although commissioners voted to eliminate submission of the document for GFOA review (at an expense of \$550), the document still meets GFOA requirements.

Finally, commissioners have asked that staff produce a seven-year Capital Improvements Program for FY 2013-2019.

At their budget retreat commissioners requested that the budget be cut and adopted a budget reduction approach recommended by the County Manager. The budget reduction strategy consisted of the following steps:

	Goal to Reduce	Cut List Amount
*Priority services	0%	2%
Mandated, non priority services	2%	4%
Other services	3%	5%
Noncore, non-mandated services	>5%	>5%
*Schools excluded from cut lists		

1. First, Commissioners established two priority services: public (K-12) schools and public safety.
2. Second, Commissioners set reduction goals:
  - Priority services remain at existing funding;
  - Mandated, non-priority services be reduced by 2%;
  - Other services be reduced by 3%; and
  - Non-mandated, non-priority services that are determined not to be essential be reduced by more than 5% or eliminated.

The approach required that all departments develop prioritized cut lists, except Chatham County Schools. Cut lists had to exceed the reduction target by at least 2% to offer flexibility to the County Manager to cut some departments less and others more, depending on needs. Commissioners further directed that “one-time” items in the FY 2011 budget were not eligible for the cuts lists. The approach is summarized in the table above. The County Manager’s office developed targets for each department based on the categories set by Commissioners.

3. Third, in addition to cut lists, departments also developed a prioritized list of non-mandated services. County Manager’s office staff met with departments to review prioritized services lists and suggested services that might be considered for reduction or elimination.
4. Finally, the County Manager reviewed the proposed cuts and accepted those that did not impede the department from providing essential services.

**Document:**

Staff requests feedback on:

- Are the recommended operating and CIP documents effective?
- Are the department work plans included in the document effective for informing commissioner decisions? Departmental goals, objectives, and measures are necessary to meet GFOA requirements.
- What additional changes do Commissioners want to see in FY 2012-2013?

**Process:**

- Was the calendar that was followed effective?
- Is the Heads Up document produced before the retreat effective for informing Commissioners’ priorities? Could this document be eliminated?
- What additional changes do Commissioners think would make the process more effective or efficient?

Ms. Paschal asked the Board for any recommendations on how to make the documents, either the operating or CIP documents, more effective or how to change the process to make it more effective.

Commissioner Kost voiced a concern regarding lack of organizational goals. She stated that she feels like it is a fundamental responsibility of the Board as they set the course of the Board. She stated they didn't do that. She questioned whether we would get the GFOA award without organizational goals which are a big deal to them. She stated that she thinks as they have the retreat, they need to talk about those goals. On a budget document standpoint, there are a couple of things which she would find helpful. She stated to Ms. Paschal that she believes she shows percentage changes or dollar amount changes, and she would like to see both. She stated that she would also like to see the budget highlight section strengthened. Particularly with the last budget, they made a lot of cuts that are buried into the budget and they did not know about. She stated that they would have known about them if they had gone through the budget as they would have had the opportunity to ask, but there are cuts that are not highlighted anywhere. Some departments made some substantial cuts that she is not sure what they cut. She reiterated that she would like the budget highlight section to really explain of the differences and the changes.

Ms. Paschal asked if there was anything the Board would be willing to cut from the budget document stating that they were up to 260 pages. She stated that over eighteen years, they have added to the document.

Chairman Bock asked Ms. Paschal if she had any recommendations of anything in the budget that she feels they are not looking at.

Ms. Paschal stated that they would be bringing some recommendations to the Board later in the process. She stated that they are not prepared to address them today about how to streamline the work plan so that there is not the volume, goals, objectives, and performance measures.

Commissioner Kost stated that she felt the revenue section of the budget message was excellent stating that it had dramatically improved over the years.

Commissioner Stewart asked about the days of the retreat and how it is organized. She stated that they need to make sure they cover most everything at that point because they are given the direction there so they don't wait until the last minute.

Chairman Bock stated that they spend a lot of time on the CIP stating that that might not be the best use of their time.

By consensus, the Board agreed.

Commissioner Kost stated that she really wants to see them talking at the retreat about organizational goals which is the first step.

Commissioner Stewart stated that she felt there should be more discussion on what is coming. She stated that they set the budget and talk about the things they are going to do. They need to be looking further out and discussing some of that.

Commissioner Petty stated that he felt that was the reason they are going to the seven-year CIP. Commissioner Kost concurred.

Commissioner Stewart stated that there are certain things that will impact it. It is more than that when they talk about operating expenses, improvements that have to be made, and really talking more about how the revaluation could impact us, how the cuts at the State-level education will play out, and discussing where they need to be going.

Commissioner Kost stated that she realizes that there was some resistance of having a facilitated retreat; however, she would like for them to reconsider it. Staff does the best they can but they are trying to answer questions and stay one step ahead of the Board. It takes

some real skill sets to bring together five people who have different ideas so that they can have a good discussion. She praised Chairman Bock stating that she thought he did a good job on trying to keep things moving, but they did get bogged down. A facilitator could help keep them moving, get them through it, and make it more productive.

Ms. Paschal stated that staff would bring back a calendar for adoption at either the next meeting or the second meeting in September. She stated that they will also try to follow-up and address the issues that were identified today to make sure they are clear on what the Board intends and to make sure that staff is producing what the Board intends.

### **CLOSED SESSION**

Commissioner Cross moved, seconded by Commissioner Petty, to go out of the Work Session and convene in Closed Session for the purpose of consulting with the County Attorney on matters of property acquisition and the approval of Closed Session Minutes. The motion carried five (5) to zero (0).

### **WORK SESSION**

Commissioner Cross moved, seconded by Commissioner Stewart, to adjourn the Closed Session and reconvene in the Work Session. The motion carried five (5) to zero (0).

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Commissioner Stewart moved, seconded by Commissioner Kost, to adjourn the meeting. The motion carried five (5) to zero (0), and the meeting was adjourned at 5:26 PM.

---

Brian Bock, Chairman

ATTEST:

---

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