

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
ROWAN COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
October 15, 2001 – 7:00 PM
J. NEWTON COHEN SR. ROOM, ADMINISTRATION BUILDING**

Present: Steve Blount, Chairman
Gus Andrews, Vice-Chairman
Arnold Chamberlain, Member
Frank Tadlock, Member
Leda Belk, Member

The County Manager, the Clerk to the Board and the Finance Director and the County Attorney were also present.

Chairman Blount called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm.

Chairman Blount welcomed Boy Scout Troop 443 from St. John's Lutheran Church and Boy Scout Troop 476 from St. Mark's Lutheran Church.

Commissioner Tadlock provided the Invocation and the Boy Scout Troops led the Pledge of Allegiance.

ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA:

- Commissioner Chamberlain stated that he had some old business he wished to address
- Commissioner Andrews requested to add an update on East Spencer.
- Chairman Blount wished to add corrections to previous minutes of the Board.
- Chairman Blount requested to add an Executive Session for the discussion of an Economic Development Issue.
- Mr. Russell requested to add a request from the Sheriff's Department to surplus weapons.

COMMISSIONER LIAISON REPORTS:

Commissioner Chamberlain mentioned that Rowan Vocational Opportunities recently received a State Award and stated that this was “most innovated” recognition.

CONSIDERATION OF THE CONSENT AGENDA:

Commissioner Tadlock made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Commissioner Chamberlain seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

The Consent Agenda consisted of the following:

- A. Approval of the unanimous road name petition for Booth Road.
- B. NC DOT request for Redhaven Drive to be added to the Secondary Road System for maintenance.
- C. Approval of Budget Amendments.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR Z-26-01 AND CUP-25-01, RA TO MFR BY H&H PROPERITES:

Chairman Blount declared the public hearing for consideration of Z-26-01 and CUP-25-01 to be in session and stated that the hearing would focus on the applications submitted by H&H Properties for rezoning Tax Parcel 356-092 from RA (Rural Agricultural) to MFR (Multi-Family Residential (Exhibit A) and the issuance of a conditional use permit (Exhibit B) upon the same parcel. This property is located at 7540 US 52 Highway, Rockwell, NC.

The Clerk swore in all those that came forward to provide testimony in this case.

Ed Muire, from the Planning Department, gave the staff review (Exhibit C) through a review of pictures in a power point presentation (Exhibit D). Mr. Muire stated that this rezoning would allow the owner to add additional apartments and added that fair and reasonable conditions that mitigate adverse impacts to the surrounding area could be attached to the conditional use permit.

Mr. Muire presented the Zoning Review through pictures in the power point presentation (Exhibit D) showing the locations and residences of surrounding property owners. Mr. Muire reviewed the following:

- 1. The relationship and conformity with any plans and policies.
- 2. The consistency and the requested zoning district’s purpose and intent.

3. The Compatibility of all uses within the proposed district classification with other properties and conditions in the vicinity.
4. The potential impact on facilities, such as road, utilities and schools.
5. Special requirements.
 - Dimensional Requirements
 - Density
 - Setbacks

Mr. Muire then reviewed the Site Plan (Exhibit E).

Mr. Muire proceeded to present the Conditional Use Review by referring to the Site Plan (Exhibit E) and referencing the following:

- a. Adequate transportation access to the site exists.
- b. The use will not significantly detract from the character of the surrounding area.
- c. Hazardous safety conditions will not result.
- d. The use will not generate significant noise, odor, glare or dust.
- e. Excessive traffic or parking problems will not result.
- f. The use will not create significant visual impacts for adjoining properties or passersby.

Mr. Muire stated that the Planning Board held a courtesy public hearing and unanimously recommended forwarding a favorable recommendation to the Board of Commissioners.

Staff recommended approval with the following conditions:

1. The expanded portion of the parking lot is to be constructed of either asphalt or concrete.
2. Fire hydrant placement on the site is to be based on the recommendation from the Codes Enforcement Department or the Fire Marshall.
3. Obtain approvals for both the design of the water system, from the Public Water Supply branch of the NC Division of Water Quality, and for a private sewer lift station, from the NC DENR, prior to initiating the construction of the units.
4. Submittal of a sedimentation / erosion control plan or waiver.
5. Maintenance of all on-site improvements is to be the responsibility of H&H Properties.

Chairman Blount opened the public hearing to entertain comments.

There being no further testimony, Chairman Blount closed the public hearing and declared the deliberation period open, stating that no further testimony may be presented.

Commissioner Chamberlain made a motion to grant the rezoning and conditional use permit from RA to MFR from H&H Properties based on the five conditions presented by staff. Commissioner Andrews seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Blount stated the **FINDING OF FACT** to be the five items listed in the written report on zoning:

1. The relationship and conformity with any plans and policies.
2. The consistency and the requested zoning district's purpose and intent.
3. The compatibility of all uses within the proposed district classification with other properties and conditions in the vicinity.
4. The potential impact on facilities, such as roads, utilities and schools.
5. Special requirements.
 - a. Dimensional Requirements
 - b. Density
 - c. Setbacks

And also items a-f in the Conditional Use Review:

- a. Adequate transportation access to the site exists.
- b. The use will not significantly detract from the character of the surrounding area.
- c. Hazardous safety conditions will not result.
- d. The use will not generate significant noise, odor, glare or dust.
- e. Excessive traffic or parking problems will not result.
- f. The use will not create significant visual impacts for adjoining properties or passersby.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR Z-24-01 AND CUP-23-01, CBI TO IND BY CURTIS DEAN ROYAL:

Chairman Blount declared the public hearing for Z-24-01 and CUP-23-01 to be in session. This request was for a rezoning from CBI (Commercial, Business, Industrial) to IND (Industrial) (Exhibit A) with an associated conditional use permit to approve expansion of a salvage yard. This application presented by Curtis Dean Royal to approve construction of a new building to house business operations.

The Clerk swore in those that came forward to provide testimony in this case.

Marion Lytle, from the Planning Department, reviewed with the Board the background to this case as stated in the staff report (Exhibit D). Expansion of the buildings on this property would require a rezoning to IND as well as a conditional use permit. The proposed new building would be to house current operations on the site. Mr. Lytle, through a power point presentation (Exhibit C), showed various maps, views of the building, expansion plans, screening plans and adjoining properties.

Mr. Lytle reviewed four items presented by staff for the zoning review and also the six items for the conditional use permit.

Mr. Lytle stated that the Planning Board held a courtesy public hearing in which three citizens made comments. The Planning Board voted unanimously to recommend approval of the request with clarification that the rest of the operation remains as it is at this time.

Staff supported a favorable recommendation to the Board of Commissioners.

Chairman Blount asked if the clarification is a condition of the conditional use permit to which Mr. Lytle stated that the Planning Board requested that the clarification be added as a condition of the conditional use permit that the operation would remain as a salvage yard operation.

Commissioner Andrews asked about the entrance for the conditional use permit as voiced by a citizen during the Planning Board courtesy hearing. Mr. Lytle stated that there is one entrance shown and that this approval would prevent a new entrance.

Commissioner Tadlock asked if the clarification was just a verbal agreement. Mr. Lytle stated that “you could put in a condition” and stated that the concern of the two salvage yard applications were that IND zoning allows uses that would not be allowed in commercial zoning. Mr. Lytle stated that this is understood and agreed by the applicant.

Chairman Blount opened the public hearing to entertain comments.

There being no further testimony, Chairman Blount closed the public hearing and declared the deliberation period open, stating that no further testimony may be presented.

Commissioner Andrews made a motion to accept the rezoning, as recommended by staff, with the conditions covering the concerns on the industrial part not changing and that no new roads in the future, without coming back to the Board of Commissioners. Commissioner Tadlock seconded the motion.

Commissioner Chamberlain clarified that the application was not for a conditional use district and therefore, the zoning and the conditional use permit should be voted on separately.

The motion passed unanimously for the rezoning.

Commissioner Chamberlain made a motion to grant the conditional use permit with the conditions as listed. Commissioner Tadlock seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Blount stated the **FINDINGS OF FACT** to be the four (4) items as written in staff’s report for zoning:

1. The relationship and conformity with any plans and policies.
2. The compatibility with all uses within the proposed districts purpose and intent.
3. The consistency with this article and the request districts purpose and intent.
4. The potential impact on schools, utilities, etc.

And also the six (6) items as written and listed for the conditional use permit:

1. Adequate transportation access to the site exists.
2. The use will not significantly detract from the character of the surrounding area.
3. Hazardous safety conditions will not result.
4. The use will not generate significant noise, odor, glare or dust.
5. Excessive traffic or parking problems will not result.
6. The use will not create significant visual impacts for adjoining properties or passersby.

PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE AMENDMENTS FOR THE ROAD NAMING AND ADDRESSING ORDINANCE:

Adrian Rollans, GIS Coordinator, stated that the proposed changes to the Road Naming and Address Display Ordinance would allow staff to complete the update of structure addressing and also provide a procedural framework for future addressing and road name signing.

Mr. Rollans noted that the four (4) changes are:

1. Additional definitions of key terms
2. Addition of procedures for address assignment
3. Procedures and conditions for address reassignment
4. Incorporation of procedures for road naming petitions

Staff recommended the adoption of the ordinance as revised.

Chairman Blount opened the public hearing to entertain comments from the audience.

There being no one present who wished to address the Board, Chairman Blount closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Tadlock made a motion to approve the adoption of the amended ordinance as presented. Commissioner Chamberlain seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

PRESENTATION FROM THE ARCHITECTS FOR THE NEW SOUTH ROWAN LIBRARY:

Phil Barton, Library Director, Bill Burgin and Judy Kandl, from Ramsey Burgin Smith Architects, presented the Board with the plans for the new South Rowan Library by showing a site plan, a floor plan and elevations. Mr. Barton handed the Board copies of these drawings.

Mr. Barton gave the introduction by stating his quotation: “Form Follows Function” and how wonderful it has been to work with the architects. Mr. Barton reviewed the layout of the library internally for showing the general public areas, public meeting rooms, service desk area, the children’s area and the adult area that would consist of a place for reading, a study/computer area and a small meeting room. Mr. Barton described the porch as a unique feature overlooking the greenway.

Mr. Burgin reviewed the greenway and parking areas, which will share an overflow of parking with the South Rowan YMCA. The library will have a more rural setting with an amphitheater and learning center. Mr. Burgin added that the designs present an open plan for future direction and expandability.

Ms. Kandl discussed the three designs for the elevation. The first design was from the Kimball Road Elevation, which shows the tower with the clock on the building and identifies the entrances to the library. The second design showed the entry elevation and presented the longer view of the structure and is what would be seen from the parking lot. The third designed showed the greenway elevation with the porch and balcony overlooking the greenway.

The Board expressed their appreciation for this update and presentation.

Mr. Russell added that the property had recently been closed on and Rowan County is the proud owners.

REPORT ON ROWAN COUNTY EMPLOYEE’S “SUCCESSFUL” UNITED WAY CAMPAIGN:

Rita Foil reported to the Board that Rowan County employees raised over \$50,000.00 for the United Way Campaign. Rowan County was named as a “Pacesetter” which meant that the County was one of about eight organizations that began an earlier campaign to set the pace for the other organizations in the County. The goal was to raise 10 percent greater than the previous year and Rowan County had a 21 percent increase over last year.

Commissioner Chamberlain reminded everyone that the United Way Beauty Contest is scheduled for November 8, 2001 at Catawba College and “jokingly” suggested that Chairman Blount make this a required attendance.

Chairman Blount then presented Ms. Foil with a certificate honoring her as “Employee of the Month” for October.

PRESENTATION OF THE COURTHOUSE SECURITY PLAN:

Mr. Russell stated that the Manager’s Plan for security at the courthouse facility was at the request of the Board, for the manager to review the plan, submitted by the Sheriff, for specifically the estimated costs. Mr. Russell also reviewed the plan presented by the Courthouse Security Committee and information obtained from a security services company.

During Mr. Russell’s evaluation of the proposed plans, Commissioner Chamberlain expressed that he was not opposed to listening to the Manager’s report, but for clarification stated to Mr. Russell, in reference to the Manager’s Plan for Security at the courthouse facility, “that is not what we asked you to do”. Commissioner Chamberlain referred to the motion made by Commissioner Andrews at the previous Board meeting and said that Mr. Russell was told to work with the Sheriff’s Department to get figures together and reiterated to Mr. Russell “that is not what you were told to do by this Board”. Commissioner Chamberlain said that the consensus was that the Board liked the Sheriff’s plan, but wanted to know what money would be entailed. Commissioner Chamberlain asked to have the Sheriff come forward. Chairman Blount stated to do so after the Manager responded to the comments.

Mr. Russell asked the Chairman if he could refer to the five issues that the Sheriff responded to when asked by staff. The five issues addressed the operating hours of the security system, the non-working hours for staff, the use of vacation, sick, educational leave, the availability of staff to manage the identification badge process and the use of surveillance monitoring for the entire complex. Mr. Russell then referred to his evaluation of the costs and asked, “Did I not do what the Board asked me to do”. Chairman Blount stated that he did and asked Commissioner Andrews if the Manager’s report responded to his request for information. Commissioner Andrews stated that “yes” it did address the cost for the doors and equipment.

Commissioner Tadlock said that the Sheriff presented his plan; staff reported their findings and others have visited other court security systems and the Board is being presented with this information after consulting with the Sheriff. Commissioner Tadlock asked the Board to give the Manager the time and respect to give his report.

Chairman Blount asked the manager to proceed with this plan. Mr. Russell continued to state that staff began with the Sheriff’s plan and built in the necessary components such as camera surveillance system, special detention center entrance, security at all non-controlled access doors and controlled access security, for an additional cost of \$189,472 and under which the Sheriff’s plan could be implemented for approximately \$598,855 and operated annually thereafter for approximately \$350,000.

Sheriff Wilhelm told the Board that his plan was a “minimum plan” which did not include cameras and staff to monitor and feels that although the “add-ons” are good and he agrees with them, his system would work without them. Sheriff Wilhelm expressed that “you are giving me more than I asked for”.

The Board continued to discuss the Sheriff’s plan, the cost factor, the staff needed and the flexibility of usage of staff and scheduling. Sheriff Wilhelm explained that there are currently 20-25 special deputies and most of the work a first shift job, which would make it impractical to use them in these positions. Sheriff Wilhelm stated that the Commissioners could close down the courthouse after hours and as a Sheriff, he does not have this authority. Commissioner Andrews stated the need of a coordinated effort for the safety of everyone at the courthouse. Sheriff Wilhelm explained the flexibility of the two K-9 dogs that could be used in the jails, schools, etc.

Commissioner Belk asked about the equipment funding. Sheriff Wilhelm stated that they should be getting the drug seizure money, but there is no guarantee when it will come and stated that he would rather not use it for the surveillance equipment. Most of the drug seizure money would be used for equipment that would protect the officers. In response to concerns brought up by Commissioner Andrews, Sheriff Wilhelm stated that the drug money is not guaranteed and he does not intend to use the money for funding officer positions. Sheriff Wilhelm stated that these positions would be up to the Board to decide.

Chairman Blount stated that the Manager’s position is that if the Sheriff’s security plan were implemented, very shortly the add-ons would be needed. Mr. Russell stated that this is a system that would always need to be critiqued and improved.

Sheriff Wilhelm addressed the security person hired from the LLEBG funds would be someone who could study security and decide what is needed in the courthouse, schools, etc.

Commissioner Andrews asked the Sheriff if there is anything, from a security standpoint that is the Sheriff’s responsibility, that proportionately has directed this much money and personnel as a priority. Sheriff Wilhelm stated that this proposed plan was requested and he looks at the overall security of the community, but Rowan County is one of the last to do something.

Sheriff Wilhelm stated that the courthouse is the least secure facility in Rowan County because it is the least monitored. It has the most strangers entering each day and criminals are being “tried” there each day. Chairman Blount reviewed the various buildings in Rowan County without any security, such as the elementary schools, the Health Department, DSS, Administration, and 402 North Main. Sheriff Wilhelm stated that the potential danger is greater in the courthouse than anywhere else.

Commissioner Chamberlain informed the Board of his experiences in the courthouse and that “the time has come”.

Commissioner Chamberlain made a motion to accept the Sheriff's plan as presented at the previous meeting, with the addition of the security devices on the closed doors, which is \$7,840, then as the Board / Staff sees fit, anything needed to be added, we can do it.

Commissioner Andrews asked Commissioner Chamberlain how much this would cost. Commissioner Chamberlain responded "a little over \$500,000". Commissioner Andrews emphasized that his concern has always been "money" and there was no "money" mentioned in this motion.

Discussion took place concerning the cost to be funded by the drug money and what amount would be County funded. After staff presented the amounts, Leslie Heidrick, Finance Director, stated that the total cost to the County would be \$315,740, covering eight months in this current fiscal year and is inclusive of using the drug money, which would be \$144,700. The recurring cost would be the salary for the deputies. Commissioner Andrews asked Sheriff Wilhelm again, if the new officers could be used anywhere else in the County, other than the courthouse. Sheriff Wilhelm stated that the K-9 dogs could be used in the County as needed, but the deputies would be used in the courthouse only with the exception of the K-9 officers.

Chairman Blount stated the motion was to adopt the Sheriff's plan as presented at the previous meeting, with the addition of the door hardware at \$7,840, and with the reduction of the \$144,700 in forfeiture money for a total expenditure for eight (8) months for approximately \$315,740.

Since there appeared to be confusion on these amounts, Chairman Blount called for a break at 8:50 p.m.

Chairman Blount reconvened the meeting at 9:00 p.m.

Ms. Heidrick stated the revised cost for the security system would be \$282,579, with \$100,990 in federal forfeiture money for a total amount of \$181,589.

Commissioner Chamberlain stated his motion to adopt the Sheriff's plan as presented with the addition of \$7,840 for the security devices on the closed doors for a total amount, for eight (8) months, of \$282,579 with the stipulation we are looking to get \$100,990 from the federal forfeiture funds, which will make the County's outlay for this fiscal year, \$181,589.

Commissioner Andrews asked what the recurring cost would be for the next fiscal year. Ms. Heidrick answered that the amount would be \$275,133 for personnel cost plus any type of merit or cost-of-living raises.

Commissioner Andrews expressed his concerns about the utilization in the scheduling of the deputies, when it appears they could be used in other places. Sheriff Wilhelm stated that the Magistrates, the Clerk of Court, the District Attorney and the various courts in session have tried to work the deputy's schedules. Commissioner Andrews asked if these

deputies could be available to work out in the field. The Sheriff stated that walking through security might deter people from coming to the courthouse, which may free up some deputies to work in the field, but that would be hard to determine.

Commissioner Andrews asked the Sheriff if this plan is not voted on, do we have security in the courthouse? Sheriff Wilhelm stated “yes” to a point. There are two (2) armed officers in each courtroom.

The motion died for a lack of a second.

Chairman Blount recommended that approval of a security plan be delayed until the Planning Retreat and the normal budget cycle.

Commissioner Belk stated the need for security and voiced concern about economic uncertainties and suggested to wait until the retreat and know what money is in place.

Commissioner Tadlock stated that the amount \$275,000 is equal to almost ½ cent tax increase and voiced concern about a tax increase with at this time. Commissioner Tadlock stated a need to continue to study this and substantiate the funding.

Chairman Blount reviewed the Courthouse Security Committee and expressed at the beginning, the Board of Commissioners would have a difficult time funding an “illusion of security” instead of a real security system. Chairman Blount applauded the Sheriff’s plan, but it still appears to be an “illusion”. The Board has now seen the Committee’s plan; the Sheriff’s plan and the Manager’s plan and still are waiting on the County Security Facility Specialist and the view this person could bring. Chairman Blount suggested waiting until budget time to discuss this matter further and if the Board feels this is a priority, they may possibly consider a tax increase to pay for the system.

Commissioner Andrews made a motion to proceed on the basis of following the numbers given tonight to enhance the Sheriff being able to get started and bring it to the floor for a vote at the next meeting.

Chairman Blount stated that the motion is to pursue this issue further and put it on the agenda for the next meeting. Commissioner Chamberlain seconded the motion.

Chairman Blount suggested that Commissioner Andrews work with the Manager, Sheriff and the Finance Director to work with the funding.

The motion carried unanimously.

ADDITION:

Surplus Weapons:

Sheriff Wilhelm informed the Board that these weapons consist of old handguns, rifles and shotguns and there is no reasonable use for them. Therefore, the Sheriff requested that they be declared surplus to allow solicitation of bids from licensed law enforcement firearm dealers.

Commissioner Tadlock made a motion to declare the weapons surplus. Commissioner Belk seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

DISCUSSION OF THE MORATORIUM ON SIGNS:

Mr. Lytle stated that the Planning Board has set a public hearing for October 22, 2001 on the proposed sign regulations. Staff recommends an extension of 30 days.

Commissioner Chamberlain made a motion to extend the moratorium for 45 days from the October 19, 2001 date. Commissioner Belk seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Andrews made a motion to set a public hearing for the Board to consider this ordinance at the second meeting in November at a time designated by the Clerk. Commissioner Chamberlain seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

REVIEW OF THE RECOMMENDATION FOR THE 2004-2010 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP):

Mr. Lytle reviewed staff's recommended list of priorities for the 2004-2010 TIP public hearings, which are:

- I-85 as a whole is the top priority
- The widening of Statesville Blvd.
- The widening and relocation of US 52
- Peach Orchard Road Extension
- Connecting the existing NC 152 to the new US 52
- The realignment of Church Street and NC 152 in China Grove
- Widening of Mooresville Road from Salisbury to Briggs Road

Chairman Blount recommended that Mr. Lytle meet with Dan Mikkleson, from the City of Salisbury, to discuss the renaming of Peach Orchard / Airport to insure joint clarity.

DISCUSSION ON THE CONSERVATION EASEMENT AT THE ROWAN COUNTY AIRPORT:

Don Conner, Environmental Services Director, reviewed with the Board the proposed Conservation Easement and a map of the County owned property along Grants Creek, noting the changes. If approved, these changes will be worked up by the LandTrust to be put in the Conservation Easement. Staff proposed a 100-foot easement on the three parcels on the north side of the creek and east of Rowan Mill Road and a 300-foot

easement on the four parcels on the south side of the creek adjacent to the airport and old landfill.

Commissioner Chamberlain made a motion to grant the Conservation Easements as presented. Commissioner Andrews seconded and the motion passed unanimously.

UPDATE ON THE LGC REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE TO EAST SPENCER:

Mr. Russell updated the Board on the status of East Spencer and stated that Vance Holliman, from the LGC (Local Government Commission) explored the interest of Rowan County to assist the LGC in handling various tasks for the Town of East Spencer. Mr. Russell said Rowan County would want to help any municipality as long as it did not impair the County and cause an over burden on staff. Some areas that were suggested were Zoning and Planning and Finance – to run payroll, write checks and receipt revenues. Also in the areas of developing a fire plan and law enforcement plan. The City of Salisbury is contracting to take over the water and sewer system. A meeting is planned for Wednesday, October 17, 2001, with the LGC to discuss this further. A decision is to be made on October 19, 2001 as to whether the LGC would assume control of East Spencer.

Commissioner Andrews stated that this discussion was inclusive of his request to add East Spencer to the Agenda. Commissioner Andrews said he was concerned with the calls received from the Highway Patrol and asked what the coordination is for law enforcement. Mr. Russell stated that this is why the LGC is attempting to develop plans.

The Board gave the Manager consensus to move forward and to keep the Board updated.

ADDITIONS:

Correction of Minutes:

Ms. Foil informed the Board that, at the March 5, 2001 Board of Commission meeting, the motion incorrectly stated the approval of the “West Rowan Fire District” as an Insurance District. This should read the Mt. Ulla Fire District.

Commissioner Belk made a motion to correct the error. Commissioner Andrews seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Old Business:

Commissioner Chamberlain asked Mr. Russell if Bob Boone had contacted him about the property discussed at the previous meeting. Mr. Russell responded that he had not.

Commissioner Chamberlain asked Mr. Holshouser if there was any update on Mr. Risdon concerning Colortex. Mr. Holshouser informed the Board that Mr. Risdon did comply

with the obligation to pay the \$75,000 for taxes and the agreement was signed and recorded in the Register of Deeds Office.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD:

Chairman Blount opened the Public Comment Period to entertain comments.

There being no one in attendance who wished to address the Board, Chairman Blount closed the Public Comment Period.

Chairman Blount stated that the Board would go into Executive Session to address an Economic Development Issue at 9:50 pm.

Chairman Blount reconvened the Board into Open Session and there being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:25 p.m.

Respectively Submitted,

Rita K. Foil,
Clerk to the Board