

**MINUTES**  
**CHATHAM COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**  
**REGULAR MEETING**  
**MAY 01, 2006**

---

The Board of Commissioners (“the Board”) of the County of Chatham, North Carolina, met in the Agricultural Building Auditorium, 45 South Street, located in Pittsboro, North Carolina, at 9:00 AM on May 01, 2006.

Present: Chairman Bunkey Morgan; Vice Chair, Tommy Emerson; Commissioners Patrick Barnes, Mike Cross, and Carl Outz, County Manager, Charlie Horne; County Attorney, Robert L. Gunn; Assistant County Manager, Renee Dickson; Finance Officer, Vicki McConnell; and Clerk to the Board, Sandra B. Sublett

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND INVOCATION**

-

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

-

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman at 9:00 AM.

-

**AGENDA AND CONSENT AGENDA**

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

Chairman Morgan asked Item #2, consideration of a request to award the bid for staffing of the County’s Collection Centers by a private security firm for the Waste Management, be removed from the Consent Agenda and placed on the Regular Agenda for discussion.

The County Manager asked that an award of the bids for the Central Carolina Business Park be added to the Agenda for discussion during the Manager’s Reports.

Commissioner Emerson moved, seconded by Commissioner Cross, to approve the Agenda and Consent Agenda with the noted requests as follows:

-

1. **Minutes:** Consideration of a request for approval of Board Minutes for regular meeting held April 17, 2006 and work session held April 17, 2006

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

2. **Bid Award for Staffing at County Collection Center:** Consideration of a request to award the bid for staffing of the County’s Collection Centers by a private security firm for the Waste Management

This item was removed from the Consent Agenda and placed on the Regular Agenda for discussion.

3. **Declaring Property Surplus And Authorizing the Sale of Said Property:** Consideration of a request to adopt **Resolution #2006-21 Declaring Property Surplus Authorizing the Sale of Said Property**, attached hereto and by reference made a part

hereof.

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

4. **Resolution Reaffirming Support For Orange, Person, Chatham Mental Health Programs:** Consideration of a request to adopt **Resolution #2006-22 in Support of OPC Area Program and Resolution #2006-23 to Amend Interlocal Cooperation Agreement to Allow Immediate Suspension and Resolution to Suspend Interlocal Cooperation Agreement by Mutual Consent of the Parties**

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

Both resolutions are attached hereto and by reference made a part hereof.

#### **END OF CONSENT AGENDA**

#### **PUBLIC INPUT SESSION**

**John Gray**, 123 Cub Creek Extension, Chapel Hill, NC, stated that when he came before the Board on April 3, 2006, he presented factual information that dealt with rule of law and what the law required that is relevant to why he is present; that at the time he was at the April 3, 2006 Board of Commissioners' meeting, there was an investigation conducted on some property and a notice of violation was sent to him discussing a \$5,000 per day fines and penalties; that when the regulatory process was stated in Chatham County, there was a lot of discussion about it; that the underlying cause for his being in attendance is the prosecution of a rigid, pre-determined agenda; that the Erosion Control Office was founded ostensibly to protect the interest of the citizens and the quality of environment in the County; that there is no reasonable person that has any objection to that whatsoever; that when it is used as a tool for harassment, to attack the credibility of a citizen, to disenfranchise citizens, and to intimidate citizens, it is wrong; that he doesn't need anyone to force him to do what is right; that he has full confidence that the Board is going to do what is right; that according to the Chatham County tax records, positive ownership of the property cannot be determined; that a declaration of violation amounts to an act of criminal conduct; that he doesn't even own the piece of land; that the fact that he was before the Board on April 3, 2006, dealing with the people involved in this tells him that it happened for one or a combination of reasons: 1) Incompetence; 2) Someone was not diligent; 3) An effort to diminish his credibility before the Board; 4) Harassment; that he has had to take time away from his business to deal with this issue which has caused lost wages; that he has had to hire an attorney to advise him on this issue; that what should happen, the County should go to its liability hearing and ask that he be made "whole" for this egregious error; that it was avoidable at every step; that he hopes that the Board will see to it that it is corrected.

#### **BOARD OF COMMISSIONER MATTERS**

**Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets:** Presentation on emission budgets that the NC Division of Air Quality is in the process of establishing for the Triangle non-attainment area and the DCHC MPT involvement in that process

Jason Sullivan, Planner, introduced John Hodges-Copple with the Triangle J Council of Governments who provided an overview of the Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets that will be set by the Division of Air Quality later this year. He commented that the Triangle area ozone non-attainment area was being re-designated to maintenance status and that the budgets would be set for certain pollutants that contribute to ozone; that these budgets or limits would be set for ten (10) years and one of the decisions that the Division of Air Quality has to make is whether to set budgets on a county-by-county basis or at regional level; that they were requesting input from stakeholders; that at the present time Chatham County has four townships in the northeast that are within the ozone non-attainment area and the County's contribution to the ozone pollution is minimal compared to other counties, such as Orange, Wake, and Durham; that the implication of the budgets is that when air quality conformity analyses are conducted

periodically, the models must show that the limits are not exceeded; that if they are exceeded, federal transportation funding is put on hold for all projects, such that they cannot proceed to their next stage; that Commissioner Cross had requested him to give the Board an overview so that he could get a sense of how to proceed with discussions at the MPO level; that Commissioner Emerson commented that it was a regional issue and that a regional budget seemed reasonable since everyone was in it together.


The consensus of the Board was to recommend an area-wide budget to the Durham-Chapel Hill-Carrboro MPO.

Commissioner Cross suggested that the Board go with the Metropolitan Plan Area and make sure that they include all four townships in the County; that he thinks that has been settled; that Durham has seven votes with six voting for regional.

The County Manager asked about the exceedance of the emission standards. He asked if there was a time duration for that penalty.

Mr. Hodges-Copple stated that there is actual air quality and estimated air quality from their plans into the future; that all those things having to do with motor vehicle emissions budgets is not directed tied to their monitors; that the State takes typical weather remits (temperature, winds, etc.) and then calculate, based on their future transportation plans and future population and employment growth, what the air quality would be at those monitors in the future given those typical conditions; that when they set the budgets, that is how it is done; that when future plans are prepared and compared to the budget, it determines whether there is an exceedance; that the impact lasts until it can be demonstrated that the plans or growth are changed to show that one is back under that forecast; that every non-attainment area nationwide faces the same thing (Charlotte, Washington, DC, etc.) and that every place that has the designation has to go through the same thing. He stated that no action is required at this time except for Commissioner Cross to carry it forward to the MPO where the next decision will be made.

A copy of the presentation is as follows:

	<h1>Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets</h1>	
<p>Triangle J Council of Governments</p>	<p>State Implementation Plan for the Triangle Ozone Non-Attainment Area</p>	<p>April 19, 2006 DRAFT</p>

The NC Division of Air Quality (DAQ) is proposing to develop a “maintenance” State Implementation Plan (SIP), rather than the originally envisioned “attainment” SIP. A letter from Laura Boothe of DAQ describes important differences between the two, including the longer time frame and potential use of safety margins associated with Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets (MVEBs). Because of these differences, DAQ is allowing additional comment by MPOs on the establishment of the MVEBs.

Comments from local and regional organizations could address such issues as:

1. Whether to recommend a multi-county, MPO-centered Motor Vehicle Emission Budget (Durham, Orange, Chatham, Person) or recommend separate budgets for each of these four areas.
2. Whether to recommend the inclusion of “safety margins” in any budgets (either multi-county or separate budgets). Safety margins are additional emission levels above the modeled motor vehicle amount that would be allowed in order to account for such factors as faster than anticipated growth under existing plans, delays in the construction of

anticipated facilities to relieve congestion, or changes in modeling techniques.

3. Whether to recommend the inclusion of voluntary mitigation measures or mandatory Transportation Control Measures (TCMs) in the Triangle SIP. Voluntary mitigation measures are activities that could be pursued if emission budget levels may be exceeded, but they have no special status in the event of a budget lapse. TCMs are *required* actions described in the SIP (and which may continue in the event of a budget lapse). For example, the construction of a transit facility or the expansion of specific Transportation Demand Management activities could be included in a SIP as either voluntary mitigation measures or as Transportation Control Measures.

### ***What have the TACs done previously?***

At its January 11, 2006 meeting, the DCHC TAC voted to endorse the recommendation of the TCC from its December meeting and support separate budgets for each of the counties within DCHC MPO (Chatham, Durham and Orange). The DCHC TAC has not considered any voluntary mitigation measures or Transportation Control Measures. The TAC has not addressed the issue of safety margins for the motor vehicle emission budgets because safety margins were not an option for “attainment” SIPs, but are now an option for the “maintenance SIP.”

At its January 18, 2006 meeting, the CAMPO TAC voted to endorse a single multi-county, MPO-centered budget for the four counties that are CAMPO members: Franklin, Granville, Johnston and Wake. This decision was also supported by the Kerr-Tar RPO and the Upper Coastal Plain RPO, and was not opposed by NCDOT.

### ***Why might the DCHC TAC want to reconsider previous decisions?***

There are several possible reasons that the TAC may want to reconsider its stance on motor vehicle emission budgets and consider requesting safety margins. Some are listed below.

1. The MVEBs will be in place for a longer time and the budgets would be established for longer-term dates. Whereas the original “attainment SIP” was expected to only be in force for a couple of years before it was replaced by a “maintenance SIP,” now that a maintenance SIP is being prepared there will not be an opportunity to revisit the issue in the near term. The attainment SIP would also have set a budget for 2008, only a couple of years into the future, whereas the maintenance SIP will have budgets stretching out to 2017.
2. This extended period can exacerbate any errors in growth forecasts or facility availability. With a 2008 budget, there is greater confidence in growth forecasts and facility completion dates, which are what is modeled to develop the budgets. With a 2017 budget, especially if budgets are set for individual counties, errors in growth forecasts or facility completion date estimates could pose problems. An initial examination of the growth forecasts developed back in 2002 for the 4 townships in Chatham County in the non-attainment area, for example, suggest that growth may have been significantly underestimated based on projects already existing, approved or under consideration in NE Chatham County.
3. Significantly different tools will be used to develop the budgets, then compare future plans to the budgets. The “old” version of the Triangle Regional Model, running in TranPlan software and without the recent TTA model enhancements, will have to be used to develop the budgets, since the “new” TransCAD version of the model with the TTA enhancements won’t be available for use until later in 2006. But the newer version of the model will then be used to compare future versions of the Long Range Transportation Plan to the motor vehicle emission budgets. If these two models produce different results, there is the possibility that meeting budgets, especially for individual counties, could

be difficult

4. Additional MPO members may wish to participate in the discussions and decisions, and members may wish to spend more time on the implications of different choices. Because the issue was addressed over the December-January holiday period, some member communities may not have had the opportunity for adequate participation. Chatham County, Orange County and Hillsborough staff – 3 of the 7 MPO communities -- were not able to attend the December 21 TCC meeting. Similarly, the Chatham County, Hillsborough and Carrboro representatives were unable to attend the January 11, 2006 TAC meeting where the issue was briefly addressed. TCC members from local and regional organizations at the December 21 meeting were divided on the recommendation for 4 separate budgets for Chatham, Durham, Orange and Person counties vs. a single MPO-centered budget for the same 4 counties. Chapel Hill, Carrboro, TTA and 2 Durham staff members supported 4 separate county-level budgets and TJCOG and 2 Durham staff members supported a single MPO-centered budget. NCDOT staff voted 3-1 in favor of four separate county-level budgets.

***What are some of the major implications of 4 county-level budgets vs. a single multi-county, MPO-centered budget covering Chatham, Durham, Orange and Person Counties?***

The motor vehicle emission budget decision is complex and subject to much uncertainty. Although a single region-wide budget for all eight counties in the non-attainment area is not currently being considered, it is important to recognize that planning or budget lapses in one MPO can affect the other MPOs and rural areas if they are not resolved in a timely fashion. Documents listed later in this report provide greater detail, but a few points may be worth emphasizing:

1. The responsibilities that MPOs and NCDOT/RPOs have are the same under either option:
  - Each MPO and NCDOT must adopt growth forecasts for its areas of responsibility.
  - Each MPO and NCDOT must adopt LRTPs and TIPs for new facilities/services for its areas.
  - Each MPO (within its Metropolitan Area Boundary) and NCDOT (for rural areas) must make a conformity finding for its LRTPs and TIPs.
2. The total amount of motor vehicle emissions (air pollution from cars and trucks) allowed to be emitted, and how these emissions are calculated, are the same under either option.
3. The consequences and the timing of these consequences are the same under either option if the DCHC MPO has an LRTP or TIP that expires (a *planning* lapse) or an emissions budget is exceeded that includes Chatham, Durham or Orange County (a *conformity budget* lapse); the timing of consequences could be different for a Person County budget lapse under the MPO-centered option.

***What other information is available?***

The following background material is being posted on the Triangle Air Quality Partnership website on the State Implementation Plan Motor Vehicle Emissions Budget page <http://www.triangleair.org/>:

***Options & Implications*** -- a summary that shows maps of the original options and includes a table summarizing their major implications.

***What if?*** -- a matrix containing details on the consequences of a Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) or Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) expires in any MPO or rural county in the non-attainment area, or if a LRTP or TIP causes an emissions budget to be exceeded under either option.

***Cases for Different Options*** -- a document summarizing the arguments that have been put forward for choosing one or the other of the options.

***Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets FAQs*** -- a document that tabulates questions and responses as they develop.

*Division of Air Quality Letter* -- a letter explaining the development of the maintenance SIP.

*VMT Sources for Air Quality Modeling in the Triangle* -- a document that summarizes how the amount of travel is reflected in air quality modeling.

***Who can I contact for more information about these issues?***

For information on the development of the State Implementation Plan (SIP) and its Motor Vehicle Emission Budgets (MVEBs), contact:

Mike Abraczinskas  
Division of Air Quality  
NC Department of Environment and Natural Resources  
1641 Mail Service Center  
Raleigh, NC 27699-1641  
P: 919-715-3743  
[michael.abraczinskas@ncmail.net](mailto:michael.abraczinskas@ncmail.net)

For information on transportation air quality conformity requirements, contact:

Edward J. Dancausse  
Air Quality Specialist  
FHWA NC Division  
310 New Bern Avenue, Suite 410  
Raleigh, NC 27601-1418  
919-856-4330 x 112  
[edward.dancausse@fhwa.dot.gov](mailto:edward.dancausse@fhwa.dot.gov)

For information on MPO roles and decisions, contact:

Felix Nwoko  
City of Durham  
Public Works/Transportation Division  
101 City Hall Plaza  
Durham, NC 27701  
919-560-4366  
[felix.nwoko@durhamnc.gov](mailto:felix.nwoko@durhamnc.gov)

Edison H. Johnson, Jr., PE  
Director, N.C. Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization  
127 W. Hargett St. - Suite 406  
Raleigh, NC 27601  
Telephone: 919-807-8511  
E-Mail: [ed.johnson@ci.raleigh.nc.us](mailto:ed.johnson@ci.raleigh.nc.us)

For information on regional coordination of MVEB and conformity issues, contact:

John Hodges-Copple, Planning Director  
Triangle J Council of Governments  
PO Box 12276  
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709  
[johnhc@tjcog.org](mailto:johnhc@tjcog.org)  
Telephone: 919-558-9320

# VMT Sources for Air Quality Modeling in the Triangle

Prepared by John Hodges-Copple, Triangle J Council of Governments, April 17, 2006 version

There are three main modeling efforts, and each uses somewhat different techniques or inputs, although efforts are made to make them consistent:

- Attainment demonstration modeling – combines motor vehicle emissions with emissions from all other sources to model ozone levels at the monitoring sites during selected weather episodes.
- SIP MVEB setting modeling – uses only motor vehicle emissions to set the budgets that will be included in the State Implementation Plan.
- Conformity modeling – uses only motor vehicle emissions to compare the emissions from a long range plan or TIP to the budgets established during the SIP MVEB modeling.

For *attainment modeling* and *SIP MVEB modeling*, the forecast VMT amount is increased by 30% in counties where the NCDOT Universe File/HPMS (Rural Spreadsheet Model) is used to develop the VMT forecast, but where the county is already in or may be brought into, a travel demand model in the future. This factoring is based on observations showing that Universe File/HPMS VMT tend to under-report modeled VMT by 30% in counties where Universe File/HPMS and travel demand model VMT can be compared. This factor can be thought of as an “equivalency” factor to ensure that rural spreadsheet VMT is essentially equivalent to travel demand model VMT as the county is brought into the regional travel demand model.

An additional factor may be used in both *attainment modeling* and *SIP MVEB modeling* to try and reflect especially large anticipated growth in counties on the edge of fast growing metropolitan regions, recognizing that past VMT growth (as reflected in the regression equation used to forecast future VMT) may under-represent what is to come. These “growth” factors are arrived at through discussions among the state and local agency staffs involved in transportation and air quality planning. After soliciting input from these partners, DAQ will apply an additional 10% growth factor in Johnston County and an additional 20% growth factor in Franklin County over and above the 30% “equivalency” factor described in the previous paragraph.

For *conformity* modeling, VMT from a regional travel demand model must be used where it is available. In rural areas not covered by the regional travel demand model, *unfactored* NCDOT rural spreadsheet model VMT is used. In these rural areas, the 30% “equivalency” factor essentially serves as an additional cushion for the VMT comparison, since the MVE budget was developed with the factor, but the emissions developed for a long range plan or TIP that are compared to the budget are developed without the factor. The table below summarizes the source of VMT by county that DAQ is using for each of the three modeling efforts, *given the current coverage* and projected evolution of the Triangle Regional travel

[i]

demand Model:

VMT source	Chatham	Durham	Franklin	Granville	Johnston	Orange	Person	Wake
Attainment	RSM x 1.3	old TRM	RSM x 1.5	RSM x 1.3	RSM x 1.4	RSM x 1.3	RSM	old TRM
SIP MVEB	old TRM	old TRM	RSM x 1.5	RSM x 1.3	RSM x 1.4	RSM x 1.3	RSM	old TRM
Conformity	new TRM	new TRM	TRM/RSM	TRM/RSM	TRM/RSM	new TRM	RSM	new TRM

RSM means NCDOT Rural Spreadsheet Model; TRM means Triangle Regional travel demand Model; “old” means the unrevised TranPlan model; “new” means the TransCAD model with TTA revisions.

*TRM/RSM means the TRM is used in the part of the county covered by the TRM; RSM is used in rest of county.*

*1.3 means a 30% equivalency factor is applied; 1.4 or 1.5 means an additional 10% or 20% growth factor is applied.*

## **BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS' MATTERS**

### **Proclamation Declaring "County Clerks Week" in Chatham County:**

The Chairman stated that there was one item that he failed to place on the Agenda; that it was done on purpose; and that it is a **Proclamation Declaring April 30-May 6, 2006 as "County Clerks Week" in Chatham County**. He read the resolution in its entirety.

Commissioner Emerson moved, seconded by Commissioner Outz, to adopt **Proclamation #2006-24 Declaring April 30-May 6, 2006 as "County Clerks Week" in Chatham County**. The motion carried five (5) to zero (0). The proclamation is attached hereto and by reference made a part hereof.

**Bid Award for Staffing at County Collection Center:** Consideration of a request to award the bid for staffing of the County's Collection Centers by a private security firm for the Waste Management

Bob Holden, Solid Waste Director, stated that the County's Purchasing Agent sent out twenty invitations for bid; that five vendors submitted bids for the County to review; that County Staff designed a weighted criteria matrix which included:

- 1) Successful operation record and post experience with providing similar services to other entities
- 2) Indication of financial capability for providing services
- 3) Familiarity with service performance
- 4) Cost of providing services
- 5) Work-plan for staff
- 6) Training for staff
- 7) Staff selection process including County solicitation
- 8) Consideration in serving the diverse cultural population of Chatham County
- 9) References

He stated that an Evaluation Committee made up of two Waste Management Staff, the Purchasing Agent and a member of the Solid Waste Advisory Committee reviewed and evaluated the proposals; that after the initial review, three vendors (Lankford Protective Services, The Budd Group, and Weiser Security Services) were invited to be interviewed by the Evaluation Committee; that other considerations by the Committee were to insure current Weiser staff will be evaluated for employment if another vendor is selected as well as the wages and benefits for the collection center staff.

The Purchasing Agent stated that while Weiser has provided good service, staff felt it is a good business practice to periodically investigate and evaluate other vendors; that during this process, both Lankford and The Budd Group provided better wages and benefits for their staff as well as what seems to be better trained and more qualified guards; that if they wish to attend school, it will be paid for based on their grades; that they have insurance available if they want it; that the benefits are comparable; that during the ranking process, Lankford scored the best followed closely by The Budd Group and Weiser fell short; that even the interviews with the vendors went towards the other two; that it is unfortunate that Weiser did not successfully receive the recommendation of the Evaluation Committee, however, they felt they have made the best recommendation for the County.



Commissioner Barnes stated that he had attended all of the Solid Waste Advisory meetings; that he has always been impressed by the professionalism of the committee; that to him, it is one of the better ones in the County; that he has been since day one; that he thinks that the recommendation is excellent; that the benefits will be good; that the issue of keeping present employees hired was discussed from the first day; that that was part of the process that existing employees would remain if they chose to do so; that as it now looks, they will get a pay raise and better benefits; and that their selection is an excellent choice.

Commissioner Barnes moved, seconded by Commissioner Cross, to accept the Solid Waste Advisory Committee recommendation and award the bid to Lankford Protective Services. The motion carried five (5) to zero (0). The tabulation of annual guard services is attached hereto and by reference made a part hereof.

Commissioner Cross stated that the employees were concerned about a summer uniform and asked that whomever gets the contract that they provide the option of getting a lighter weight uniform for the summer months.

#### **Central Carolina Business Park:**

Fred Hobbs, Hobbs, Upchurch & Associates, that on Thursday, April 27, 2006, bids were received for the Central Carolina Business Park; that they recommend award of the roadway contract to Sanford Contractors with a low bid of \$5,475,479.41 and award of the culvert contract to Dellinger, Inc with a low bid of \$924,000.00.

Commissioner Emerson moved, seconded by Commissioner Barnes, to award the roadway contract to Sanford Contractors with a low bid of \$5,475,479.41 subject to the aforementioned parties and award the culvert contract to Dellinger, Inc. with a low bid of \$924,000.00. The motion carried five (5) to zero (0). A copy of the bid tabulations and the Notice of Award are attached hereto and by reference made a part hereof.

#### **MANAGER' S REPORTS**

The County Manager reported on the following:

#### **Recommended 2006-2007 Budget:**

The County Manager stated that Staff is almost ready to present the Recommended Fiscal Year 2006-2007 Budget and that they would like to hold a short meeting on Thursday, May 4, 2006 at 9:00 AM so that it can be presented and the work sessions can be set accordingly.

#### **Joint Meeting with Board of Education:**

There will be joint meeting with the Chatham County Board of Education on May 8, 2006, 6:00 PM, at the School's Administrative Offices.

There will be a formal budget hearing on the recommended budget to be held on May 15, 2006 at 6:00 PM, in the District Courtroom.

#### **Public Comments Period in Siler City:**

There will be a public comments period to be held on May 16, 2006 at 7:00 PM in the Siler City Courtroom.

#### **Joint Meeting with Town of Cary:**

There will be a joint meeting with the Town of Cary on June 7, 2006 at the North Chatham School. Time will be announced at a later date.

**Grants:**

Debra Henzey, Grants and Special Projects Manager, stated that she has helped with grants totaling \$318,150 since she arrived in September, 2005; that she had played a key role in three of these and helped with a fourth; that the latest is a three-year \$114,000 grant from Blue Cross Blue Shield Foundation of North Carolina that will fund facilities at Southwest Park and offer some fitness programming at the park; that she has also developed a workshop on Successful Grant Writing that she will offer through United Way to nonprofits in September and will also offer it through our own Leadership Academy next year; and that the goal of the workshop is to build capacity for better grant writing across the county.

She stated that the County has also received another grant to the Chatham County Health Department which she helped with, for \$29,150.00 for the parenting program submitted by Mary Linker; that she was about to get nearly twice as much money as she did the previous year, bringing the total to \$314,150; that other grants with which she has had a major role in developing or editing that have been funded to date are:

- Blue Cross Blue Shield Fit Together Grant: \$114,000 over 3 years for facilities at Southwest Park and some fitness programming
- CDBG Low-Income Water Hookup Grant: \$75,000 over 16 months
- DHHS Grant to Health Dept. for Spanish Translator: \$100,000 over 2 years
- DHHS Grant to Health Dept. for parenting program: \$29,150 for 12 months
- TOTAL: \$318,150

Mrs. Henzey stated that the County did not get the Gang Prevention Grant, which would have been another \$100,000 over two years, but that she is working on another plan for that which would also help start a youth council.

Commissioner Emerson asked if Ms. Henzey had had an opportunity to follow-up with Gold Kist.

She stated that she had not, but would be glad to do so if Commissioner Emerson would let her know with whom she needed to speak.

**Boards and Committees:**

The County Manager explained that the following was a follow-up on a previous request by the Board on Boards and Committees; that the Board was discussing changing the process for selecting and appointing to various boards and committees; that they had asked staff to survey existing groups for feedback for ideas; and that it is now before the Board.

Marilyn Collins, Deputy Clerk, stated that she had forwarded e-mail responses received from various boards over which the Board of Commissioners has authority; that all the boards have not met within the time frame in which the information was requested; that the Ag Board was having to poll their members by telephone; that there were several boards from which a response was received; and that several boards are in the process of reviewing the information.

No action was taken on this matter.

## COMMISSIONERS' REPORTS

### **One-Cent Sales Tax/Medicaid Issues:**

Commissioner Cross stated that the Short Session begins a week from Tuesday; that the Board voted to not go for the Medicaid trade but that did not consider the possibility of increasing Medicaid with the County health plan; that he wondered if the Board wanted to stay where they are; that he would expect to see a Medicaid increase in patients because of its availability in services; that he doesn't know how that would stand up against the 1% sales tax trade; that as it stands, if the County accepted the trade, it would be one and a half million per head; that as the sales tax increases, it would fall behind; that this would supposedly get rid of Medicaid forever whereas, not doing this, there would be still be a possibility of Medicaid increases annually.

### **County Assembly Day:**

Commissioner Cross mentioned County Assembly Day on May 17, 2006 from 2:00 PM – 7:00 PM.

### **Affordable Housing Luncheon:**

Commissioner Cross reminded everyone of the Affordable Housing Luncheon to be held on June 2, 2006 from 11:30 AM to 1:30 PM and stated that they could still use sponsors.

### **Festival Noise:**

Commissioner Outz asked if anyone had received a telephone call regarding the festival noise.

Chairman Morgan stated that he had talked to the Sheriff about the noise. He stated that the Sheriff had also received a lot of calls and stated that he would like to meet to discuss ideas for a solution to the problem.

### **John Gray Request:**

Commissioner Outz asked that the County Attorney review the situation about which Mr. John Gray spoke during the Public Input Session.

The County Attorney stated that he has not seen the letter to which Mr. Gray referred; that he heard what Mr. Gray had to say; and that he would not advise making a decision on it hearing only one side of it.

### **RECESS**

Commissioner Outz moved, seconded by Commissioner Cross, to recess the meeting until 9:00 AM on Thursday, May 4, 2006. The motion carried five (5) to zero (0), and the meeting was recessed at 10:12 AM.

---

Bunkey Morgan, Chairman

ATTEST:

---

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

---