

MINUTES
CHATHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
WORK SESSION
AUGUST 20, 2007

The Board of Commissioners (“the Board”) of the County of Chatham, North Carolina, met in the Central Carolina Community College Multipurpose Room, 764 West Street, located in Pittsboro, North Carolina, at 2:00 PM on August 20, 2007.

Present: Chairman Carl Thompson; Vice Chair, George Lucier; Commissioners Patrick Barnes, Mike Cross, and Tom Vanderbeck; County Manager, Charlie Horne; County Attorney, Kevin Whiteheart; Assistant County Manager, Renee Paschal; Finance Officer, Vicki McConnell; and Clerk to the Board, Sandra B. Sublett

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman at 2:03 PM.

Work Session

1. FY 2007 Budget Process Critique
2. Update on Land Transfer Tax Referendum
 - a. Status of work
 - b. Public education VS advocacy: county government activity parameters
3. Moratorium Status Work in Progress
4. TJ COG Contract Consideration (work related to moratorium issues)
5. Water System Issues Update
6. Land Banking update:
 - a. Schools
 - b. Recreation
 - c. CCCC interest
7. Rocky River Stakeholders Progress
8. Jordan Lake Nutrient Rules Draft Based on Chatham Resolution
9. Closed Session: attorney/client privilege
10. Closed Session Policy Review
11. Volunteer Indemnification
12. Affordable Housing
13. Construction Management at Risk

FY 2007 BUDGET PROCESS CRITIQUE

County Manager, Charlie Horne, stated that all budget years began with a critique of the previous year, and they were interested in what went well in addition to what they needed to improve upon.

Assistant County Manager, Renee Paschal, described what feedback they were specifically asking for with some suggested processes. Regarding the non-profit review process, she suggested: perhaps narrowing the priorities; distinguishing between continuing grants and new grants for targeted priorities; retaining a small amount, such as 5 to 10%, of total funding to be allocated by the Board; and, having staff write the recommendations to retain overall quality.

Commissioner Lucier suggested application forms be different, so there was justification for continued funding and justification for new funding; and that applications for continued funding should not be automatic. Ms. Paschal agreed.

Commissioner Lucier stated that the small amount reserved for the Commissioners to grant to agencies after the recommendations had been received should be no more than 10% of the total. Ms. Paschal suggested the decision on the amount could be made at the Board’s retreat.

Commissioner Vanderbeck agreed that having staff write the recommendations was preferable. Ms. Paschal noted that in the past, the schedule was for panel reviews of applications to be held during the day, although some Commissioners expressed an interest in holding those reviews in the evening.

Commissioner Lucier stated that it may make it difficult for some non-profits to attend the reviews, for various reasons.

Chairman Thompson stated there was a significant number of people who wanted to be a part of the process, but could not attend during the day.

Commissioner Lucier suggested conducting a web poll to identify the public's preference.

Chairman Thompson stated he would agree that 10% of the total held out for the Commissioners to grant was worth considering. He stated it would be good to separate the two areas, continued funding and new funding, and decide what percentage went to each group. Ms. Paschal reminded the Board that if current levels of funding were continued, less funding would be available next year for new funding.

Commissioner Cross stated some of the funding granted last year was used to expand operations, and agencies needed to understand that funding must be used for the purposes for which it was granted. He added that overlapping coverage among agencies should be identified.

Ms. Paschal asked for feedback as to whether the Board received the appropriate level of data; if the Board was interested in partnering with United Way on a study to determine the most critical human services needs; and, that study could not be completed in time for next year's budget, and that it would be available for the year after.

Chairman Thompson asked how the Board would participate. Ms. Paschal stated they would jointly hire a consultant to conduct the study.

Regarding the calendar and timing of the budget process, Ms. Paschal stated that some previous feedback suggested to separate the capital improvement projects from the regular budget and perhaps reviewing it at the summit.

Commissioner Cross asked if that scenario was used, would the CIP be received on December 15th as usual. Ms. Paschal responded the Board would receive the CIP prior to the December capital budget meeting, so the calendar would be moved back.

Commissioner Lucier stated he liked the idea of getting the capital budget earlier, so he would support a calendar change. He stated it would assist the staff with their work schedules, plus would allow the Board more time for decisions on major projects before entering into budget deliberations.

Chairman Thompson agreed, and determined that the Board was in agreement.

Ms. Paschal asked if the Board wanted to get its budget information all at once or over a period of time. Commissioner Vanderbeck stated he preferred to get it all at once. Commissioner Lucier agreed, with the CIP separated out as suggested.

Ms. Paschal asked if the information the Board received was sufficient. Commissioner Lucier stated he was pleased with the level of information provided. Chairman Thompson agreed, noting the Board had offered no negative feedback.

Gerald Totten, School Board Member, asked if the Commissioners wanted to receive the School CIP at the same time. Commissioner Barnes stated that would be helpful so that needs could be better analyzed.

Commissioner Lucier stated there had been times when more information was requested, but that was on a case-by-case basis. He stated that if more detail was needed on a particular line item, the Board could request it.

UPDATE ON LAND TRANSFER TAX REFERENDUM

The County Manager stated that the Board had recently moved to pursue a Land Transfer Tax, and they would provide the results of their study on what such a tax would actually provide. He stated they would also provide information on how the education regarding the tax would begin and end.

Commissioner Barnes stated that during the four days of the recent annual convention of North Carolina Association of County Commissioners, one entire day was devoted to discussion of the Land Transfer Tax, what it could do, and its pros and cons. He stated the NC Association of County Commissioners' Advocacy Group had nominated for the first time in its 100 year history, an honorary member to the Group, Commissioner Mike Cross. Commissioner Barnes stated Commissioner Cross had received that honor for his work over the past three years on the Land Transfer Tax and was the key to the State moving forward with it. Commissioner Barnes stated that award made it apparent as to what county had been instrumental in getting this through the General Assembly.

Assistant County Manager, Renee Paschal, provided a brief summary of the fiscal aspects of the Land Transfer Tax with a PowerPoint presentation, as follows:

Summary

- Would produce \$3.5 million in FY 2009
- Produces more than 3 times the revenue of a ¼-cent sales tax
- Equivalent to five cents on the property tax rate
- Proceeds are unrestricted
- Can be voted upon repeatedly without a waiting period

Effect of Reducing Impact Fee

- Impact fee is currently \$2,900
- Looked at reducing to:
 - \$1,900 (34.5%)
 - \$1,450 (50%)
 - \$1,000 (65.5%)
 - \$0 (eliminated)

Net Revenue

\$2,900 Impact Fee**	\$1,900 Impact Fee	\$1,450 Impact Fee	\$1,000 Impact Fee	\$0 Impact Fee
\$3,500,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,000,000	\$1,500,000	\$400,000

**=Revenue from Land Transfer Tax

Additional Debt Capacity in Millions

	Impact Fee at \$2,900	Impact Fee at \$1,900	Impact Fee at \$1,450	Impact Fee at \$1,000	Impact Fee at \$0
FY 2009	\$62	\$43	\$35	\$26	\$7
FY 2014	\$17	\$12	\$10	\$7	\$2
FY 2019	\$22	\$16	\$14	\$11	\$6
FY 2024	\$28	\$23	\$21	\$19	\$14
FY 2029	\$36	\$30	\$28	\$25	\$20
FY 2034	\$46	\$39	\$36	\$34	\$27

Land Transfer Tax By Price of Housing/Land

Price	Land Transfer Tax
\$100,000	\$400
\$150,000	\$600
\$200,000	\$800
\$250,000	\$1,000
\$300,000	\$1,200
\$350,000	\$1,400

Effect on New Housing/Land

Housing Price	Current	\$2,900 IF*	\$1,900 IF*	\$1,450 IF*	\$1,000 IF*
\$100,000	\$2,900	\$3,300	\$2,300	\$1,850	\$1,400
\$150,000	\$2,900	\$3,500	\$2,500	\$2,050	\$1,600
\$200,000	\$2,900	\$3,700	\$2,700	\$2,250	\$1,800
\$250,000	\$2,900	\$3,900	\$2,900	\$2,450	\$2,000
\$300,000	\$2,900	\$4,100	\$3,100	\$2,650	\$2,200
\$350,000	\$2,900	\$4,300	\$3,300	\$2,850	\$2,400

* With 0.4% Land Transfer Tax

Commissioner Lucier pointed out it had been stated that the funds could be used for anything the Board chose, but believed the funds should be used for what the Board had asked that the Land Transfer Tax be used for, which was to lower property taxes. He noted the State had approved the use of the Land Transfer Tax, not for additional revenue, but to be used for such things as CIP projects and not just any legal expenditure of the County.

Commissioner Cross agreed, noting the funds would primarily go to schools.

Commissioner Lucier asked the County Attorney if anything precluded the Board from saying that the majority of funds received through the Land Transfer Tax would be dedicated to schools. County Attorney, Kevin Whiteheart, stated that was correct, but noted that would not be binding and the Board could choose to dedicate the funds elsewhere.

The County Manager reminded the Board that the ballot would be a simple “yes or no” question regarding support of the Land Transfer Tax. He stated the education prior to the ballot could include the Board’s preference as to how those funds were used.

Commissioner Lucier stated he would like to reduce the impact fee to \$1,900 if the Land Transfer Tax passed, and asked if language should be added to the referendum. The County Attorney stated that if the Board adopted a resolution outside of the referendum, it would be sufficient to stake out that position.

Commissioner Lucier moved to reduce the impact fee to \$1,900 if the Land Transfer Tax passed. Commissioner Vanderbeck stated that he would support that pending the objective review of the polling material.

Debra Henzey, Director of Community Relations, outlined the poll cross-tabulation results, which was an attempt to distill as much data as possible from the poll. She explained

that 401 active voters were polled which generally reflected the average population of Chatham County; most of those polled owned their own home; 84% had no children under the age of 18 living at home; 54% of those polled had lived in Chatham County 20 years or longer; the poll was under represented by those making \$150,000 or more; the poll had good representation from those making \$50,000 or less; and, geographic distribution by precinct showed that the northern part of the County had the most responders.

Ms. Henzey then explained the results of the polling questions which dealt with the mood of the poll responders, such as if they believed the County was moving in the right direction, if the County was growing too fast or too slow, what they believed to be the number one problem facing the County, whether property taxes were too high, too low, or about right, and how familiar they were with the proposed Land Transfer Tax. Ms. Henzey explained the next set of questions which dealt with the Land Transfer Tax and how the revenue might be spent.

Commissioner Vanderbeck stated he was concerned about the validity of the question regarding knowledge of the poll responders about the Land Transfer Tax without them being tested on that knowledge. Ms. Henzey agreed, but noted that opinions changed later in the questionnaire when more information was given about the Land Transfer Tax. She continued explaining the results of the poll.

Commissioner Vanderbeck said it was typical that the highest number of voters would vote when there was a presidential election, so the statistics from the poll seemed to be too high. Ms. Henzey agreed, but added that all of the poll responders were registered voters and had voted in the last election. She explained the results about how people might vote if liquor by the drink were on the ballot, which showed mixed results. Ms. Henzey also explained the demographics of those polled, and what affect, if any, that might have had on the results. She emphasized that the top five issues on the poll were related to the Land Transfer Tax.

Commissioner Barnes asked for an objective opinion from Ms. Henzey regarding the results of the poll and whether or not the Land Transfer Tax should appear on the ballot. Ms. Henzey suggested that the Board get someone who was more expert at reading the results to give that kind of opinion, noting she was not an expert. She stated that the Board would need to put together a group of citizens to be the advocacy voice and to help raise funds.

Commissioner Barnes stated that key to this was a County-wide education campaign; if it failed in November then they would put in on the next ballot. He stated it would take a great deal of effort, but the County needed it and they needed to begin to work on getting it passed. Commissioner Barnes said this would require a unified Board working together, and believed getting the Land Transfer Tax approved was doable.

Commissioner Lucier stated the information derived from the poll was useful, but was cautious about a poll before a campaign started. He stated the educational component would be extraordinarily important, particularly if they wanted to benefit the schools, water and sewer programs, etc. Commissioner Lucier stated for that reason, the Board of Education should participate in the campaign to help ensure its success.

Commissioner Barnes stated he believed this Board should be available to speak at every Board of Education meeting to support the Land Transfer Tax, particularly since the vast majority of the funds received would benefit the schools. Commissioner Lucier agreed.

Commissioner Cross stated he foresaw training the School Board so that they would all be working as a cohesive unit.

Commissioner Lucier stated that he was puzzled by the poll results regarding the impact fee, noting it could have been a result of how the questions were worded. He stated that out of the ten people he had recently talked with, once he had explained it, they had all agreed they would support it, which was inconsistent with the poll results.

Commissioner Cross stated that the County was looking at a 20 to 25 cent tax increase in the next seven years due to expected debt, or, they could get approval of the Land Transfer Tax. He stated it was not a matter of "do you want this tax" but a matter of "which tax do you want." Commissioner Cross said he had not talked with anyone who opposed to the Land Transfer Tax.

Chairman Thompson said the key was making people understand the tax, and given the timeframe between now and November, he was not sure there was adequate time to provide that understanding. He stated they needed to be realistic about what could be accomplished.

Commissioner Cross stated they had asked for 1% and had promised to drop the school impact fee if they got it, which they did. He said reducing the fee from \$2,900 to \$1,900 would be a reduction of 40%, and would allow the Board to keep its promise. Commissioner Cross said if people were not locating here they would not need the funds.

Commissioner Barnes stated if they did nothing, then they were admitting defeat before even trying. He stated if they did not get out and support the Land Transfer Tax, then they would be derelict in their duty to the citizens.

Chairman Thompson stated he believed it was a question of time, noting November was just a short few months away. He said State-wide, realtors had spent over \$1 million in an attempt to defeat the Land Transfer Tax. Chairman Thompson said that was an indication that there would be opposition to the tax.

Commissioner Barnes stated that if voters did not pass the Land Transfer Tax in November, he would be the one to recommend a motion to increase the impact fee to \$3,500, and then go to work to identify how high it could be raised since someone had to pay for the schools.

Commissioner Cross reiterated that if it was defeated, they would also be looking at a 20 to 25 cent tax increase over the next seven years.

Commissioner Vanderbeck stated he would prefer a higher impact fee rather than a property tax increase.

Chairman Thompson stated he did not believe the argument was an either/or; rather, it was a question of when was the best time for them to have enough time to educate the public and place it on the ballot.

Commissioner Cross stated there was no better time than now to start the education and place it on the ballot.

Commissioner Vanderbeck stated that he understood that they could not get an objective viewpoint regarding the polling results; but, you would clearly have more turn-out in a County-wide election. He stated he would like to have the best odds in order to have the voters approve the Land Transfer Tax, and there was only about nine weeks until the election. Commissioner Vanderbeck said he would support the Board, but believed chances might be better in May.

Commissioner Cross stated those living in the northeast section of the County were the most active percentage wise and understood the Land Transfer Tax, so a low turnout County-wide may work in their favor.

Commissioner Lucier stated he believed it would be better to have it on the ballot in November rather than May, because the November ballot would be less crowded and people would be better able to focus on it. He stated if they waited until May, but had the chance to have it approved in November, then they would lose almost \$2 million in that interim period which was equivalent to more than 2 cents on the tax rate.

Chairman Thompson stated that although there was some disagreement as to when it would be on the ballot, he believed they all agreed that they would do everything necessary to see that it passed.

Commissioner Vanderbeck stated the County Attorney was going to relay some parameters about information versus advocacy, and what the Board could do and not do.

The County Attorney stated the question was to what extent the County could be involved in providing educational materials and financial resources for that education. He distributed the County's policy regarding political activity by an employee; he explained that in 2002, the Town of Cary was sued for a similar issue; in that instance Cary had begun a Smart Growth platform; Cary had put together an ad campaign including television ads; this campaign

had taken place near the time of the political campaigns; and, the suit alleged that the ad campaign was used to further the political agendas of some officials.

Mr. Whiteheart stated that counties could engage in advertising as long as it was for educational purposes, which meant that the advertising could provide only factual statements, both pro and con, to help citizens understand the issue. But, he said, if the language in the promotion or educational material implied favoritism to one side or the other, then that would not be acceptable; in the Cary case, the materials overtly said “vote for this because it is the wave of the future for Cary.”

Mr. Whiteheart said he had talked with David Lawrence at the Institute of Government regarding four issues:

1) May the Board of Commissioners organize and appoint citizens to citizens groups and task forces which will be advocating for the adoption of a land transfer tax, and, may the Commissioners be members of those groups or be involved with the groups, and the answer was yes. They are elected officials and could take a position and advocate for or against. Mr. Whiteheart said County policy would not allow County employees to serve on such groups because they were not elected officials.

2) Can the County hire and pay for a polling consultant to conduct surveys and draft questions. Mr. Whiteheart said in Mr. Lawrence’s opinion that was likely beyond what the County could do, but could not be sure. He said if the issue was, did the County want to have the election and other issues came up, then they could be paid for by the County. Mr. Whiteheart said in that respect, he believed the County could pay for a polling consultant.

3) May County employees serve on advocacy groups during regular work hours, such as working with non-elected school officials. The answer was no, since they could not engage in any advocacy for or against.

4) If the Board decides to hold meetings, public hearings or otherwise, what type of educational material or advocacy material can be distributed. The Board can call a public hearing and advocate its own position from the podium, but in terms of educational materials that would be all that the County employees would be able to provide. If the Board wanted to hold a meeting off-site and advocate for the tax to go forward, it would have to be without County funding.

Commissioner Vanderbeck stated for example there was a handout today for informational purposes, and that was permissible. Mr. Whiteheart responded it was, noting the material was to help decide “should we do it, and if so, when.” Commissioner Vanderbeck questioned if it would be permissible for a Board member to prepare his own materials at his own expense, but distribute them at a County meeting to state his own personal opinion. Mr. Whiteheart responded generally, yes, adding that the material should clearly state where it was coming from or from whom.

Commissioner Lucier stated that it was permissible for the County to pay for reproducing materials such as that distributed today. Mr. Whiteheart responded yes, since it was informational and educational.

Commissioner Lucier moved to adopt **Resolution #2007-31 of the Chatham County Board of Commissioners to Place Before the Voters on the November 6, 2007 Ballot a Referendum to Enact a Land Transfer Tax of 0.4.**

Commissioner Vanderbeck asked what the staff’s opinion was on that proposal. Assistant County Manager, Renee Paschal, stated the difference in revenue would be about \$1 million, and the County’s debt capacity would go from \$62 million to \$43 million.

Commissioner Cross seconded the motion.

Commissioner Vanderbeck stated that the poll did not give him any overwhelming evidence that if the impact fee was cut, it would gain more support, so it appeared to him that those responding in the poll had no problem with going forward with the tax. He stated he was

concerned about loosing that debt capacity, and asked the Board to think twice about cutting the impact fee from \$2,900 to \$1,900.

Commissioner Lucier stated when he had supported this all along he had said that if the County got the 1% that he would work to eliminate the impact fee, so it was a question of keeping his word and not the results of the poll.

Chairman Thompson agreed it should be reduced, but questioned if it should be reduced even lower. Commissioner Cross stated they could not afford to reduce it lower. Chairman Thompson stated the Board had said if they got the 1% there would be no impact fee, but obviously they did not get the 1%. He stated the 1% would be more progressive, but under this proposal, new home buyers would be paying less.

Commissioner Lucier stated if they lowered it any more, they would be defeating the purpose of the impact fee.

Chairman Thompson asked how much revenue they would be losing by reducing the fee to \$1,450 or \$1,500 rather than \$1,900. Ms. Paschal responded that it would be about \$200,000 for FY 2009 and \$500,000 for the next year and would increase each year.

Commissioner Cross stated that Commissioner Lucier's proposal kept the Board at its word.

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

BREAK

The Chairman called for a ten minute break.

TJ COG CONTRACT CONSIDERATION

County Manager, Charlie Horne, stated they were working on the contract now, and were suggesting that this issue be considered on September 4th. He noted that Phase 1 would consist of all planning related work, and Phase 2 would consist of actually putting the ordinances together for the Board's review.

Commissioner Lucier asked if Paul Black would attend the Environmental Review Board meetings. Mr. Horne responded he would.

Commissioner Vanderbeck asked if it would encompass the Affordable Housing Task Force, since it was part of the moratorium. Mr. Whiteheart said when looking at the contract, especially at project deliverables, there was some question whether the work being done was an actual drafting of the ordinance as opposed to the preliminary data. He stated Mr. Black had explained that his work was a two-step process, which was to do the policy work first and then that became a springboard for any ordinances or codes. Mr. Whiteheart stated Mr. Black's proposal was to do all the necessary work to create a policy document and to meet with constituent groups, and then to suggest regulatory proposals that would help during the moratorium period until the Land Use Ordinance was updated. In other words, he said, Mr. Black would offer some stop-gap measures to be used to protect the County during the moratorium. Mr. Whiteheart said the next question was, who would do the actual Land Use Ordinance update, and Mr. Black had responded that would be done either by the County or by TJCOG since it was not included in his contract. He stated if Mr. Black were to do that work, then it would basically double the amount of the contract.

Commissioner Lucier stated they already had a Land Use Plan that had not been used in the past, and what they were talking about was now implementing that plan. He stated that the contract should focus not so much on development of the policy but implementing the existing Land Use Plan.

Commissioner Vanderbeck agreed, noting that in Mr. Black's words, they were doing a quick update to shift focus to the moratorium. He said that in a sense, this was the update that

was needed, and they now needed to implement the Land Use Plan with the ordinances the various boards were working so hard on.

The County Attorney stated that Mr. Black may not fully understand what the Board was asking for, but because of the size of the task before him, there was some confusion as to what he should be focusing on.

Commissioner Lucier suggested that one or two of the Board members meet with him to clear up that confusion. Mr. Whiteheart agreed that would be helpful. Commissioner Lucier stated he was the liaison to several of those boards and would like to do that.

Commissioner Vanderbeck asked to be included. There was no objection from the Board.

AGENDA REVISION

Chairman Thompson stated the agenda needed to be amended due to the late hour. He suggested delaying Item #5, moving Items #6 and #8 under Commissioner's Matters for this evening's meeting, and hearing Items #3 and #7 today. Chairman Thompson stated they would hold the Closed Session this evening, and would delay Items #11, #12, and #13 until the Board's next meeting. There was no objection from the Board.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING TASK FORCE UPDATE

Amy Powell, Affordable Housing Task Force, provided a brief update on the work of the Task Force and outlined recommendations that they intended to pursue. She noted they were behind schedule on the items the Board had outlined for work by the Moratorium Task Force, but were attempting to get back on schedule; that the County Attorney had given the opinion that since inclusionary zoning was not prohibited by State statute, that the Task Force could proceed with proposing it for Chatham County; they needed a legal opinion on whether or not County-wide zoning was needed to implement an inclusionary zoning requirement; the Board of Commissioners had approved \$25,000 to fund the update of the 2002 Affordable Housing Needs Assessment and conduct an Affordable Housing Summit; that contractor interviews would be held next week, the contract executed by October 1st, and assessment work and recommendations completed by January 15th; the Affordable Housing Summit was scheduled for early spring 2008; and, the Task Force continued to work on a recommendation to ensure long-term affordability and retention of affordable housing stock.

Ms. Powell stated that professional staff was needed now to: outline the pros and cons of inclusionary zoning so that a recommendation could be made to the Board of Commissioners; and, to develop an inclusionary zoning ordinance that would include a long-term affordability policy. She said once the Affordable Housing Plan was in place, there would be ongoing staffing and administrative costs associated with overseeing the inclusionary zoning ordinance, monitoring the long-term affordability policy, and allocating affordable housing resources.

Commissioner Vanderbeck stated the Task Force was somewhat behind because of its late start, but believed if some staffing help was provided, they could get back on schedule. He stated the issue of inclusionary zoning or incentive zoning, density bonuses and others could then be studied and they could get back on their timetable.

PLANNING BOARD ZONING SUBCOMMITTEE UPDATE

Jim Hinkley, Planning Board Member, stated that the Subcommittee had met in five work sessions with two more scheduled. He reviewed the charge given to the Zoning Subcommittee: 1) to review the Zoning Ordinance text; 2) to make recommendations for text changes; and 3) to make recommendations for respective zoning districts and mapping. He outlined their accomplishments to date: review of the entire Zoning Ordinance; creation of a zoning use table; creation of an independent Board of Adjustment; and culling of unnecessary amendment pages and reformatting. Mr. Hinkley stated their current task was to revise and augment the definitions of the ordinance, and left to be done was to reformat the permitted and conditional use sections of the ordinance; rename, eliminate and/or create new zoning districts; and, revise the zoning map.

Mr. Hinkley stated that professional assistance would be needed beginning at the end of September to coordinate, rewrite, and codify their work. He stated a minimum of 80 hours, possibly extending to 120 hours, of concentrated professional assistance would be required.

Commissioner Vanderbeck thanked Mr. Hinkley for all the hard work the Subcommittee had done.

PROGRESS REPORT ON SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS REVISIONS

Sally Kost, Planning Board Member, stated their task was to review and recommend changes to the existing subdivision regulations. She stated the Subcommittee had divided its work into three major categories: 1) the subdivision review process; 2) subdivision design, layout, and standards; and 3) format of the regulations. Ms. Kost then reviewed the goals for each of those categories.

Ms. Kost described the progress to date: the Subcommittee had drafted a new subdivision review process that met all stated goals; the Subcommittee hosted a meeting in which representatives from the Green Building Task Force, the Board of Education, the Environmental Review Board, the Appearance Commission as well as representatives from other interested groups attended; those groups provided feedback on the draft process which the Subcommittee was currently evaluating and incorporating into the draft process; and, the Subcommittee had begun working on the second phase of their task, which was the design, standards, and layout, but was awaiting staff support.

Commissioner Lucier asked when that staff support might be possible. The County Manager stated they were working on establishing job descriptions which could then be advertised, but some interim consultant work might be needed in the interim. Commissioner Lucier agreed, noting that work should begin as soon as possible.

Keith Megginson, Planning Director, stated another issue was the Major Corridor Task Force and a part of that was the zoning of areas along major corridors. He stated the Board would need to consider an alternative date after September 10th because needed materials would not be delivered by that time.

Commissioner Vanderbeck recalled that Mr. Megginson had expressed concern previously that September 10th may be too soon.

Chairman Thompson suggested changing the date to the September 17th regular evening meeting or perhaps September 24th.

Commissioner Vanderbeck stated he would be out of town on September 24th, and asked that another date be considered. The Board then discussed various dates.

Commissioner Lucier moved, seconded by Commissioner Vanderbeck, to hold a public hearing on the zoning of major corridors plus additional areas previously discussed on Tuesday, September 25, 2007 in the Superior Courtroom at 7:00 PM. The motion carried five (5) to zero (0).

ELEMENTARY SCHOOL'S MOBILE CLASSROOM UPDATE

Gerald Totten, School Board Member, noted that as of Thursday, all of the trailers had been set back to 17 feet as agreed upon at the last Work Session; that the contract had been let this morning for the steel and wooden barrier on the school's side of the ditch; and that September 17th was the day they would give this Board a report on its review committees.

ROCKY RIVER STAKEHOLDERS PROGRESS

The County Manager stated the target for the meeting was within the next two weeks, once contacts had been made with all parties. He stated there was one contingency item regarding the request by Siler City to have one additional representation on the Stakeholders Group, which needed to be responded to. Mr. Horne said the other issue was that a group from NC State University had volunteered to help coordinate some of this work, as reported at the last meeting.

Commissioner Lucier moved, seconded by Commissioner Barnes, to add an additional citizen from the Town of Siler City to the Rocky River Stakeholders Task Force. The motion carried five (5) to zero (0).

Sonny Keisler stated one of the recommendations was that the Board accept the services from a group from the NC State Cooperative Extension Division, and asked Ms. Perrin to address the Board.

Christy Perrin, Project Manager, Watershed Education for Communities and Local Officials at NC State, stated that they worked with communities on building capacity for water resource management, most often through stakeholder groups in a collaborative effort. She stated that financial support was primarily through grants. Ms. Perrin said there were many divisive issues that needed to be addressed and suggested looking at a broader civic engagement, perhaps through other organizations who could contribute ideas regarding watershed planning and implementation.

Steve Smutko, Cooperative Extension, NC State Natural Resources Institute, noted his work included natural resources policy and environmental policy management. He stated they organize, manage, and facilitate stakeholder groups towards decision making, and would be interested in contracting with Chatham County to work with the stakeholder group.

Commissioner Lucier stated the role of the Cooperative Extension would be to facilitate the activities of the Stakeholders Group, adding the focus had to be on the Rocky River before the focus was broadened. He encouraged the Board to move forward and accept the help offered by putting forward a contract for consideration. Mr. Horne said staff would develop a scope of work to get the process started. Mr. Smutko agreed to help with that process.

Chairman Thompson stated it appeared the Board was in agreement to move forward and develop a scope of work.

Commissioner Cross asked to tentatively set five dates for the Land Transfer Public Referendum Sessions. Chairman Thompson stated he believed that would be appropriate. The Board discussed several dates and locations, and the following dates were chosen:

Land Transfer Public Referendum Sessions:

September 10, 2007, 7:00 PM – Commissioner Barnes’s District
September 20, 2007, 7:00 PM – Commissioner Lucier’s District
September 27, 2007, 7:00 PM – Commissioner Vanderbeck’s District
October 4, 2007, 7:00 PM – Chairman Thompson’s District
October 11, 2007, 7:00 PM – Commissioner Cross’ District

Commissioner Lucier stated that Item #5 on tonight’s agenda, preliminary approval of the Parks at Meadowview, should be removed from the Consent Agenda for discussion to clarify some issues brought forward in letters from the Wildlife Commission and the School Board. There was no objection from the Board.

ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Vanderbeck moved, seconded by Commissioner Cross, to adjourn the Work Session. The motion carried five (5) to zero (0), and the meeting was adjourned at 4:56 PM.

Carl Thompson, Sr., Chairman

ATTEST:

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