

**THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA**

Monday, January 6, 2003

9:00 A.M. Worksession

MINUTES

Place: Commissioners' Room, second floor, Durham County Government Administrative Complex, 200 E. Main Street, Durham, NC

Present: Chairman Ellen W. Reckhow, Vice-Chairman Joe W. Bowser, and Commissioners Philip R. Cousin Jr., Becky M. Heron, and Mary D. Jacobs

Absent: None

Presider: Chairman Reckhow

Chairman Reckhow greeted those present for the Worksession and called for the first speaker to come forward.

Citizen Comments—Ray Guthrie

Mr. Ray Guthrie, 2214 Rada Drive, had requested time on the agenda to speak to the Commissioners regarding the Social Services Department.

Mr. Guthrie thanked the County Commissioners for the opportunity to speak regarding the removal of his grandchildren from their home. He recalled his 41-year law enforcement career and expressed the opinion that they had been taken improperly and illegally. He asked that an investigation be conducted for these children regarding the environment at their foster home. He also called for an audit of the Durham County Department of Social Services. He expressed the opinion that Social Services was dispensing money and services to persons who did not qualify.

Chairman Reckhow asked Dan Hudgins, Department of Social Services Director, to follow up on the request for an investigation.

Commissioner Heron asked to set a time frame of two weeks for a report from Mr. Hudgins.

Citizen Comments—Jack Steer

Mr. Jack Steer, 2416 Dawn Trail, had requested time on the agenda to speak to the Commissioners regarding the FY 2002-2003 Budget process.

Mr. Steer, representing the Friends of Durham, spoke regarding the budget process. He stated that a correct budget presentation is transparent; it has a column showing the objectives declared by the management the previous year and another column to show the actual results at the end of the year. Then one can address new activities. As the budget is currently presented, he did not see how management could observe clearly what is happening. Old activities and new appear together, and they cannot be compared. He called for linkage—between the Commissioners' desires and the plan of action put into place by the County Manager and department heads to accomplish those desires.

Mr. Steer stated that a good portion of the County's budget goes to the Durham Public Schools which, in his opinion, has done a good job with its budget over the last couple of years. He expressed the opinion that the Commissioners should examine and talk about it as the schools' budget, and not get involved in using the school system's budget as a way of changing school policy. The County Commissioners should not try to deal with school problems; that is the realm of the Board of Education. He said his feeling was that coming between the school administration or the Board of Education and any special interest groups is outside their province. Using the school budget as a hostage for changes wanted by the Commissioners or another group amounts to extortion.

Chairman Reckhow agreed with Mr. Steer regarding the budget process. The County is trying to move toward a performance-based budget. Several departments are already doing this very well, including the library.

Commissioner Heron stated she agreed with zero-based budgeting. She said she was impressed that The Durham Center is moving in that direction. She agreed that departments had to keep track of taxpayer dollars spent and account for their performance.

Citizen Comments—James Chavis

Mr. James G. Chavis Jr., 801 Underwood Avenue, Apartment C, had requested time on the agenda to speak to the Commissioners regarding the Social Services Department.

Mr. Chavis said he had spoken with Dan Hudgins, Social Services Director, who was to handle this matter concerning his treatment by the department. He reportedly had not heard the results from Mr. Hudgins and asked for an update. He spoke negatively of the manner in which Social Services treats the handicapped and disabled, saying his treatment was disrespectful during the period of August 2002 to December 2002.

Chairman Reckhow asked Mr. Hudgins if he could provide an update at this point.

Mr. Hudgins, Social Services Director, advised that he had spoken with Mr. Chavis during the past two weeks. Mr. Chavis had applied for two types of assistance; one had been approved, the other had not. Mr. Hudgins intended to provide an update this week regarding the non-approved assistance. There had been a misunderstanding between Mr. Chavis and the social worker about the need to make separate application for the two assistance programs. This is in the process of being resolved, with the second program being put into place retroactive to the date he first visited the agency.

Mr. Hudgins explained that presently one must make a separate application for each assistance program due to technology limitations. In the future, with the proposed single-entry system, this need should be eliminated.

In answer to Vice-Chairman Bowser's question, Mr. Hudgins advised he would supply the Commissioners a report when both programs for Mr. Chavis are in operation.

Citizen Comments—Thelma White

Ms. Thelma White, 1015 Jerome Road, had requested time on the agenda to speak to the Commissioners regarding transportation issues.

Ms. White asked the Commissioners to be proactive and improve the traffic flow to and around the Shops at Southpointe mall. Two main arteries to carry traffic into the mall are not enough. The present arteries, Fayetteville Road and Southpointe Boulevard, are not sufficient to support traffic coming into the mall, especially during high-volume periods. She suggested that an extension be built to Southpointe Boulevard to connect with Barbee Road. This would relieve some of the congestion on Fayetteville Road and I-40. Ms. White asked the Commissioners to take her suggestions into consideration with the next Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP).

Chairman Reckhow asked to see Ms. White's comments conveyed to the City, since it has jurisdiction on that road. She wanted either Ms. White to present the proposal to the City Council or for the Board of Commissioners to forward this information to City Council.

Commissioner Heron suggested that Ms. White attend the next Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) meeting on the following Wednesday, at 7:00 p.m. The meetings begin with an opportunity for citizens to address concerns. This is where the TIP is approved.

Durham County Women's Commission Report

The Durham County Women's Commission had a needs assessment conducted to look at the status of women in Durham County.

Ms. Kimberly Thornton, Chair, Durham County Women's Commission, would present the findings of the report and make suggestions to the County Commissioners.

Resource Person(s): Kimberly Thornton, Chair, Durham County Women's Commission

County Manager's Recommendation: The County Manager recommended that the Board receive the report.

Ms. Gale Meyer made the presentation. She introduced four other members of the Women's Commission present in the audience: Kimberly Thornton, chairman; Veronica Hicks, vice chairman; Linda Forman; and Annette Anderson Bailey.

Ms. Meyer stated that the Women's Commission worked with a student from the Department of City and Regional Planning at UNC-Chapel Hill to analyze census data to build a portrait of Durham county women. The report has extensive data. A set of summary charts was provided to the Commissioners, since the report would be so difficult to cover in a brief time.

Ms. Meyer covered demographic background, specific issues, and summarized where the Women's Commission would go from here.

She reported that, according to the 2000 US Census, women make up about 51.8% of Durham County's total population of 223,314. Of the 115,684 women in the county, about 50.6% are Caucasian, 41.5% are African-American, and 5.3% are Hispanic or other minority. Thus, the female population is divided nearly equally among whites and minorities. Among women, the median age for Caucasians is 38, for African-Americans is 31, and for Hispanics is 23.

Ms. Meyer noted that the percentage of young women aged 19 and under increases significantly in the minority categories.

Of Durham County families, about 24% are headed by single mothers. Almost 15% of those have children under age 18. More than 8% of single mothers are unemployed. Female-headed households represent about 60% of households in poverty and hold 60% of the income deficit (debt).

Ms. Meyer continued her very detailed report of the findings of the census data analysis. In summary, she described the data regarding single-family households, educational attainment, incomes, unemployment, and poverty levels.

Of note is that 30% of Caucasian, 40% of African-American, and 47% of Hispanic women make less than the median income of \$25,098, even though much of the workforce is employed in education, health care, and in Research Triangle Park careers.

Ms. Meyer stated that the Women's Commission intends to distribute the report widely to organizations and groups that are working on any variety of women's issues to help them understand more the population they are dealing with and some of the prevalent issues. The Women's Commission hopes to help form partnerships and sponsor programs to deal

with women's issues. It is a priority for the Commission to recruit a Hispanic member, which the group lacks.

Ms. Meyer asked the Board of County Commissioners to keep this report in mind and use it as a guide as the Board makes policy decisions. She asked the Commissioners for any questions or comments they might have.

Regarding the table indicating percentages of women below the poverty level (8% Caucasian, 20% African-American, and 28% Hispanic), Vice-Chairman Bowser asked if these were working women. Ms. Meyer answered that the chart represents the community as a whole. Chart #24 gave the specific income levels by race.

Commissioner Jacobs commended Ms. Meyer and the other members of the Women's Commission. She commented that, as a member of the first Women's Commission in 1987, this assessment had been an objective. At that time, the group did not have resources to do this. Accomplishing this information gathering is a big step for the group. She asked if the Women's Commission had any immediate plans for publicizing this report, given that this is Women's History Month. Commissioner Jacobs asked the group to keep the Commissioners informed of its plans.

Ms. Meyer advised that the report would be sent to organizations, groups, and the media. More specific plans of direction would be made at the group's next meeting.

Commissioner Heron asked if the earnings reported were only for women without a spouse or if it included all women. Ms. Meyer answered that the income figures are only for women and do not include their husbands' income.

Commissioner Heron and Chairman Reckhow complimented the group for the depth of the report and relayed their thanks. They looked forward to a follow-up. This would provide good information for the Commissioner retreat.

Environmental Indicators Report from the City-County Environmental Affairs Board

The Durham City-County Environmental Affairs Board (EAB) consists of citizen volunteers appointed by the City Council, the Board of County Commissioners, and the Soil and Water Conservation Board of Supervisors. Among its charges are to advise the elected bodies on environmental policy, educate public and local officials on environmental issues, and perform special studies and projects requested by the City and/or County on environmental issues. The EAB was requested to develop a set of environmental indicators that can be used to track environmental conditions within the County from year to year. These indicators can serve as important educational, motivational, and planning tools for citizens and policy makers. The report contains a list of indicators developed by the EAB with input from relevant City and County departments, local environmental groups, and appropriate government agencies, as well as recommends that the County begin a more comprehensive process of setting goals and

taking further action. Representatives from the EAB will present the report and respond to any questions that the Board may have.

Resource Person(s): Judy Kincaid, Chairman of the Environmental Affairs Board

County Manager's Recommendation: Receive the report and advise staff of any actions to be taken.

Chairman Reckhow asked Ms. Judy Kincaid, Chairman of the Environmental Affairs Board (EAB), to introduce the other members present.

Ms. Kincaid introduced Vice-Chairman Joe Jackson, Marian Johnson-Thompson, William Anderson, and Kathi Beratan. Ms. Kincaid stated that Chairman Reckhow had asked the Environmental Affairs Board to develop some environmental indicators that could be used as a benchmark to track how the county is doing over time in environmental health. The Environmental Affairs Board had done this, and its conclusions and recommendations were to be presented at this meeting.

In the process of developing environmental indicators, the EAB arrived at a potential list of indicators and then met with or contacted City and County staff, relevant local environmental groups, and state agency representatives for comment. Their comments were considered, and a final list was made. Only indicators for which there is actually data available were included in the final list of environmental indicators. As better data becomes available for measurement, other excellent indicators might be added. The indicators were prioritized and set at three maximum for each of the seven categories: air quality, water quality, solid waste, toxics, biodiversity, transportation, and energy.

Ms. Kincaid commented that the EAB is an all-volunteer board and has limited resources. The indicators should be presented on an ongoing basis, but this is a start. She suggested that staff support should be provided for creating an ongoing process of setting environmental goals, strategies, and action steps, and then tying the environmental indicators to those. For the long term, these should be monitored through a process of review and revision as necessary.

The Environmental Affairs Board was disappointed that it could not do a better job of connecting environmental issues with social equity and economic issues. Environmental pollution impacts people economically when creates a public health issue (as an increase in asthma cases). It may also create a social equity issue in some communities that are impacted differently.

The EAB also reached the conclusion that better coordination is needed between the City and County governments and the school system in setting environmental goals and developing strategies and action steps. Ms. Kincaid stated there should be an advocate to work on this coordination between units. She commented that a better job could be done of partnering with local universities, federal and state agencies, and environmental groups to achieve these environmental goals.

The EAB wants to involve and educate neighborhoods with setting and achieving environmental goals.

Ms. Kincaid provided a list of steps to set an environmental indicators strategy and to set an environmental management system. These parallel closely.

ENVIRONMENTAL INDICATORS STRATEGY	ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SYSTEM
1. Define goals	1. Set policy
2. Identify problems	2. Identify environmental aspects
3. Prioritize problems	3. Prioritize aspects
4. Set targets	4. Set targets
5. Outline strategies	5. Set up implementation procedure
6. Define indicators	6. Monitor & measure
7. Review and revise	7. Review & revise

Ms. Kincaid stated she hoped that both the City and County governments undertake some environmental management systems in the near future.

She summarized by stating the EAB's hope that the report would be utilized, with staff resources devoted to building and expanding on it, and engaging the community to create meaningful environmental indicators. The Environmental Affairs Board would be happy to meet with the Commissioners, the County Manager, and others in coming months to discuss in more detail how that might happen. Ms. Kincaid ended the presentation and called for Commissioner comment and question.

Commissioner Heron complimented Ms. Kincaid on the complexity and detail of the report. She stated that this is exceptional for a volunteer board. She expressed her appreciation for the report and stated that it should be put into action, as it contains too much good information to waste. She suggested that the Board ask the County Manager to set a meeting with the Chairman of the EAB to learn how to move forward with this. The Board of County Commissioners must study the environmental impact of development and existing situations in the county. It could be copied by adjoining counties.

Vice-Chairman Bowser thanked Ms. Kincaid for the report and the work of the entire Environmental Affairs Board. He stated his concern over the number of asthma cases in Durham County. He said this couldn't be ignored, especially given that many adults develop it later in life. Vice-Chairman Bowser commented that he looked forward to working with the EAB in these issues.

Commissioner Heron, regarding wildlife corridors and open space walking trails, spoke of the current fight to have the NCDOT alter its specifications for the bridge on Highway 15-501 over New Hope Creek. She remarked that, as designed, it is not high enough for

wildlife or people to walk under. She stated that the EAB could help with matters of this kind.

Chairman Reckhow added her thanks and remarked that, when the EAB was created, it was hoped that the community could capitalize on the expertise of its members, the local universities, and major employers. She agreed that it would be appropriate for the County Manager to meet with the EAB and discuss ways to put this report into operation in the County and City governments. Placing a staff person with environmental expertise in the C-C Planning Department could be discussed in a budget session. She also suggested units of measurement for vehicle trip reduction for the EAB's transportation environmental indicator.

Review of Memorandum of Understanding With the Durham Public Schools

The Durham County Board of Commissioners and the Board of Education for the Durham Public Schools have agreed to develop annual Memoranda of Understanding (MOU) in order to strategically identify issues/initiatives of mutual interest. The agreement is largely an effort to ensure strong channels of communication between both boards while working to improve the quality of education for students attending the Durham Public Schools.

The Superintendent and County Manager have agreed upon an MOU for the 2002-2003 Fiscal Year. The MOU carries forward all of last year's understandings. However, both parties have also recommended that additional language be included relative to the provision of evaluations and status reports on the Hillside High School Plan.

Resource Persons: Mike Ruffin, County Manager

County Manager's Recommendation: The County Manager recommends that the Board review the proposed Memorandum of Understanding and advise staff of any additional changes or issues that should be incorporated therein.

Chairman Reckhow recognized the Durham Public Schools Board of Education members in attendance: Chairman Kathryn Meyers, Gail Heath, Regina George-Bowden, and Michael Page.

County Manager Mike Ruffin introduced the item. He commented that this was a compilation from previous years' memoranda. The last version had been distributed last summer to the Durham Public Schools Board of Education and the Board of County Commissioners. Requests for revisions from both boards have been incorporated in the latest draft version. Lakeview School had been dropped from #4; Hillside High School had been added. In Item #1, the fiscal year was updated to 2004. County Manager Ruffin called for questions and comments for himself or Dr. Denlinger, Superintendent of Durham Public Schools.

The Commissioners requested to continue to receive copies of Lakeview program evaluations. Dr. Denlinger reported that the Commissioners previously received copies of an in-depth evaluation, and could continue to receive academic evaluations. She stated that Lakeview continues to be an outstanding alternative school, and is recognized as being one of the best in the state. She thanked the County Commissioners and Board of Education for making it that.

By consensus, Lakeview School was added back to item #4.

Under item #10, Commissioner Heron wanted wording to reflect that the two boards could meet jointly more than semi-annually. County Manager Ruffin advised that it would be more difficult in summer and fall; a meeting would be set for February after polling both boards. It was suggested that periodic meetings be set for a full year.

Under item #8, in reference to joint planning, it was recommended that wording include the Board of Education, County of Durham, and City of Durham. It was suggested that the County Manager and Superintendent develop a written protocol on the process for choosing future school sites.

Chairman Reckhow stated that this Memorandum of Understanding should have been adopted at the front end of the budget year, rather than in January. It was placed on the agenda for the next Regular Session for a vote.

Commissioner Jacobs asked if the MOU of previous years had been complied with. Chairman Reckhow stated that it had generally worked and had helped to smooth the budget process with the school system.

Vice-Chairman Bowser agreed, stated that there were still some areas needing work, and posed that this is the arena to bring the two boards together.

In answer to Commissioner Jacobs, Dr. Denlinger stated that the practice has been that the County Commissioners would approve the MOU first, then she would present it to the Board of Education for its action. Chairman Reckhow added that this is an annual process and is very important as it provides an operational agreement during this budget year.

Vice-Chairman Bowser asked County Manager Ruffin about the additional language included regarding the Hillside High School plan. The County Manager explained that this requires the school system to provide a report regarding the use of about \$315,000 in funding under phase one. The report would include the accomplishments made compared to goals set during the first year of implementation of the school plan at Hillside.

Dr. Denlinger added that the report would provide academic results for this school year and accountability for the use of public dollars. The report would address whether the public funds invested for the two-year plan for Hillside High School have been

effectively implemented and whether the funding has resulted in an improved educational environment for Hillside students.

Commissioner Heron asked that the MOU include a report on the number of students based on official count in September.

Under item #2, Commissioner Jacobs asked if it would be proper to receive the school reports prior to the media, to be able to prepare for their questions. County Attorney Chuck Kitchen advised that the School Board had indicated its intent was not to withhold something from the press. The press has expressed its concern that these reports are public record and, therefore, cannot be withheld from them when initially released.

Chairman Reckhow stated that the MOU, with its changes, would be placed on the consent agenda for the next Regular Session on January 13, 2003.

Quasi-Judicial Hearing: Major Special Use Permit—New Elementary School “A”, Phase I—Ephesus Church Road (Case M02-04)

The purpose of this item was:

1. To hold a quasi-judicial hearing to consider a Major Special Use Permit for a public school in the R-20 District, and
2. To direct the Planning Director to prepare an order for adoption for either 1)approval, 2)approval with conditions, or 3)denial, or to continue the hearing to a specified later meeting. A draft order for approval with staff-recommended conditions would be available at the meeting.

Coulter Jewell Thames, PA, on behalf of Durham Public Schools, has submitted a Major Special Use Permit for an 81,385 square-foot, one- and two-story elementary school for 609 students, with 138 motor vehicle and nine bicycle parking spaces on a ± 17.48 acre portion of a ± 37.46 acre site. The property is located at the southeastern corner of the intersection of Ephesus Church Road and George King Road (PIN 0709-03-12-9503; tax reference 485-2-8; County Atlas Page 85, Blocks A-3, A-4). Governing Body approval of the Major Special Use Permit is required for public schools in the R-20 District. Notice of the governing board consideration of this Major Special Use Permit will be published in the newspaper in accordance with the requirements of the Durham Zoning Ordinance Section 13.2.2.3 Major Special Use Permits.

Resource Person(s): Frank M. Duke, AICP, Planning Director

County Manager’s Recommendation: The County Manager recommended that the Board continue the Quasi-Judicial Hearing; any action thereupon requires a suspension of the rules.

Chairman Reckhow asked for guidance from County Attorney Chuck Kitchen.

County Attorney Kitchen summarized where the Board was in the procedure. A Quasi-Judicial Hearing had taken place at the last Regular Session. He advised that anyone having been contacted since then by members of the public would now need to disclose its nature. The Board had closed the testimony and voted to receive additional information prior to making a final decision. This was conveyed by letter to the Board of Education; the letter should be properly marked as Exhibit C. The Board must reopen the testimony to receive additional information today. Persons giving testimony would be called either proponents or opponents. Dr. Lavonia I. Allison, an opponent, was not present due to a schedule conflict.

Chairman Reckhow suggested the hearing be opened for the purpose of receiving answers to previously submitted questions. She asked the Commissioners if anyone had any disclosure of communication since the last hearing. No one had received new information. They had been contacted only through email and phone calls expressing opinions, and the media from the Herald-Sun and TV News-14 asking for statements. Commissioner Jacobs offered that, being a newly-elected County Commissioner, she had met on December 13, 2002 for a briefing of the case with Mike Ruffin, County Manager; Hugh Osteen, DPS Assistant Superintendent for Operational Services; and Calvin Dobbins, Associate Superintendent for Administrative Services.

Chairman Reckhow reopened the hearing and asked that any persons who needed to be sworn in should do so with Garry E. Umstead, the Clerk to the Board. These persons would be other than those previously sworn in.

Mr. Garry E. Umstead, Clerk to the Board, administered the oath to Hugh Osteen from Durham Public Schools, traffic engineer Lyle Overcash (to speak to transportation issues), land planner Jarvis Martin (to speak to the general compatibility of this school with the proposed location), and Wesley Parham, City of Durham Transportation Department (TIA).

Mr. Frank Duke acknowledged that the staff report included revisions to the executive summary of the TIA (Traffic Impact Analysis). The revised staff report and a full copy of the TIA was entered into evidence.

Chairman Reckhow stated that the procedure would be to hear from Planning staff and other County witnesses, the applicant and its witnesses, then from any opponents to the request. The testimony was to be limited to answering questions. Any cross-examination by opponents must pertain to the answers to the questions. Any evidence to be presented to the Board by report, map, or exhibit should be done during one's testimony.

Mr. Wesley Parham, City of Durham Transportation Department, addressed the transportation issues that had been raised. He summarized the requirements for the Traffic Impact Analysis, which was prepared. All of the conditions required for study preparation and the subsequent recommendations were adhered to, according to the review of the Transportation Department and the NCDOT. All requirements and concerns regarding safety and proper ingress and egress have been met.

The Commissioners discussed the importance of providing for sidewalks and bike lanes on the approach to this proposed school site. Both are provided under the proposed site plan. Commissioners Heron and Reckhow stressed that it would be more appropriate to provide four-foot-wide bike lanes near a school site rather than the standard two-foot-wide lanes currently proposed. They suggested that bike lanes should be four feet wide and striped in the proximity of a school and continue to be four feet wide along nearby housing developments. This should be communicated to City Council.

Vice-Chairman Bowser asked if widening Highway 54 and Old Chapel Hill Road had been considered. Mr. Parham advised that the TIA study area did not extend that far to the south. The study area did extend to the intersection of Farrington Road and Chapel Hill Road to the north. Farrington Road will require widening at its intersection with Ephesus Church Road due to a projected 10-percent increase in traffic.

Vice-Chairman Bowser asked the record to reflect that Mr. Parham was asked to double-check the traffic service level rate on Highway 54 between the intersections of Farrington Road and Highway 751. Vice-Chairman Bowser referred to extensive previous dialog by the Board concerning a proposal to build an office park in the area of Highway 54 and I-40. The Planning Department had recommended denial of the proposal due to traffic in the area.

Chairman Reckhow asked if any proponents had questions for Mr. Parham. There were none. She next called for the proponent to present its witnesses—Mr. Overcash and Mr. Osteen.

Mr. Lyle Overcash, a civil engineer and licensed professional traffic engineer, prepared the Traffic Impact Analysis on behalf of the Durham Public Schools. He submitted two copies for the record. All local and state NCDOT requirements have been met. Mr. Overcash pointed out all the intersections that would require new left-turn lanes to accommodate the projected increase in traffic and stated that Ephesus Church Road should be increased to three lanes from Farrington Road to at least its intersection with George King Road. The TIA recommended paving George King Road, a gravel road, from Ephesus Church Road to the bus parking lot driveway.

Mr. Hugh Osteen, Assistant Superintendent for Operational Services, Durham Public Schools, introduced the Board of Education members present: Chairman Kathryn Meyers, Vice-Chairman Regina George-Bowden, Gail Heath, Phillis Scott, and Michael Page. He also introduced Superintendent Dr. Ann Denlinger, Associate Superintendent for Administrative Services Calvin Dobbins, and Construction Coordinator Tracy Webster.

Ms. Osteen stated that the school system was willing to adjust the bike lane issue as long as it does not require a resubmittal of the site plan. He submitted into evidence the requested "Probable Cost Estimate" that was created by Roger M. Harris Jr. of Harris & Associates Inc. of Greenville SC and provided for The Freelon Group, PA, the architect

of record. Mr. Osteen reported that the school system would be able to get all of its off-site road improvements and water and sewer for approximately \$412,000, rather than the earlier projected \$450,000.

Vice-Chairman Bowser asked for the cost estimates for upgrading just Ephesus Church Road.

Mr. Osteen addressed two other issues of concern—a question regarding the 1993 facilities plan and inner-city schools deficiencies never addressed, and the long-range facilities plan with an update schedule. He reported he had researched archived school documents released by the state from 1993 forward and found that the only code violations found related to handicap accessibility (ADA-related), the absence of exit signs, or a fire stair or fire wall. Those have all been subsequently corrected. All school facilities are inspected twice yearly by the Durham County Fire Marshal's office and the City-County electrical inspector.

Mr. Osteen reported that the drafts of the long-range facilities plan should be presented to the Board of Education in late January. Public Hearings would be held in the weeks following. Final drafts should be presented and approved in late February.

Mr. Dan Jewell, representing the architectural firm of Coulter Jewell Thames P.A., answered a question for Vice-Chairman Bowser regarding utilities. Mr. Jewell advised that no utility lines must be moved, just extended to the site.

Mr. Osteen urged the Commissioners to act expediently on this request. Time delays in the permit process would cause a year's delay in opening the school.

There being no further evidence to present related to the questions, Chairman Reckhow closed the Quasi-Judicial Hearing.

Commissioner Heron moved, seconded by Vice-Chairman Bowser, to suspend the rules to permit the Board to vote on this item due to time constraints on school construction.

The motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Heron moved, seconded by Chairman Reckhow, to approve the Major Special Use Permit for Case M02-04, New Elementary School "A", Phase I, with Special Condition #2 changed to reflect the "County or City" of Durham.

Vice-Chairman Bowser expressed his concern that other sites had not been adequately considered and that the 17-acre Lowe's Grove site was considered too small, even though

later statements indicated that at least a 15-acre site was needed. He expressed the opinion that the Ephesus Church Road site was too large, and that the paving cost estimates for George King Road and four turning lanes elsewhere was extremely low, leading to project cost overruns. Vice-Chairman Bowser stated he would vote against this Major Special Use Permit due to the County's budget constraints and because he felt the information he received from the Durham Public Schools was not factual.

In answer to Commissioner Jacobs' question regarding the feasibility of using the Lowe's Grove school site, Chairman Reckhow advised that the school system is studying the possibility of using the site for a needed elementary school in that area.

Commissioner Jacobs stated that this school site was not where she would like to see it, but that time constraints and the immediate need for a new elementary school call for a motion of approval.

Commissioner Heron commented that Durham County has a limited number of appropriate school sites and that good public use of the extra land was a certainty. She urged the Board to move the item forward.

Commissioner Cousin advised he is keenly aware of school crowding and the need for another elementary school in that area. Future development of the area is definite, as is the need to provide schools for that development.

Chairman Reckhow advised she would vote in support of the motion. The Board of Education approved the site for purchase in September 1991. Since then, the school system has presented a two-story design as the Board requested, leaving more of the site available for a future public use. She urged the Board to move forward due to the pressing need for another elementary school in that area.

Chairman Reckhow called for a vote on the motion put forward by Commissioner Heron.

The motion carried with the following 3-2 vote:
Ayes: Heron, Jacobs, and Reckhow
Noes: Bowser and Cousin

Commissioner Jacobs moved, seconded by Commissioner Cousin, that the Board push very diligently for a new bond referendum so that another school could be built in southwest Durham County. Lowe's Grove would be the priority site if the feasibility study is positive in its traffic impact analysis.

The motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Heron moved, seconded by Commissioner Cousin, that the Board direct the County Attorney to begin to work on an adequate public facilities ordinance that would not require legislative approval.

The motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Cousin made a suggestion for the upcoming Commissioner Retreat. He suggested the Board discuss making a recommendation that residential developers perhaps make some provisions for providing land on which to build a school in addition to providing a school impact analysis for a building site.

Commissioner Heron moved, seconded by Commissioner Jacobs, to adopt the order (Major Special Use Permit for Durham Public Schools, Case M02-04) with special conditions as amended.

The motion carried with the following 4-1 vote:
Ayes: Cousin, Heron, Jacobs, and Reckhow
Noes: Bowser

The order follows:

ORDER GRANTING, UPON CERTAIN CONDITIONS,
A MAJOR SPECIAL USE PERMIT FOR
DURHAM PUBLIC SCHOOLS
TAX MAP 485-2-8, PIN 0709-03-12-9503
CASE M02-04

The Board of County Commissioners of the County of Durham, having conducted a hearing on Case M02-04 and having considered all evidence presented at such hearing, hereby determines that the Ordinance requirements for the granting of a Major Special Use Permit in this case have been met, and that the Use Permit should be granted upon certain conditions.

THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS HEREBY MAKES THE FOLLOWING FINDINGS OF FACT, based on evidence and testimony presented at the public hearing, that the proposed use, a new elementary school with 609 students, meets the requirements of 13.2.3 of the Durham Zoning Ordinance, and that the proposed project is

1. In harmony with the area and not substantially injurious to the value of properties in the general vicinity; and
2. In conformance with all special requirements applicable to the use and in conformance with the Supplementary Requirements Section of this Ordinance; and

3. Will not adversely affect the health or safety of the public.

THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS ALSO FINDS that considerations listed in 13.2.4 of the Ordinance have been addressed.

THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS FURTHER DETERMINES THAT IT IS NECESSARY TO CONDITION THE GRANTING OF THE USE PERMIT UPON THE FOLLOWING:

1. Special conditions attached hereto as Exhibit A.

THEREFORE, the Major Special Use Permit in this matter is hereby granted with this condition.

THIS SPECIAL USE PERMIT SHALL BECOME NULL AND VOID UPON DETERMINATION BY THE APPROPRIATE OFFICIALS DESIGNATED BY ORDINANCE THAT THE ABOVE CONDITION HAS NOT BEEN COMPLIED WITH.

This determination and Order is effective upon and after the date of its adoption as shown by the stamp of the Clerk to the Board of County Commissioners below.

Approved By The Board of County Commissioners

January 6, 2003

/s/ Garry E. Umstead
Clerk to the Board

NORTH CAROLINA
DURHAM COUNTY

I, Susan B. Page, Notary Public of the aforesaid County and State, certify that personally appeared before me this day, Garry E. Umstead, Clerk to the Board of County Commissioners of the County of Durham, who duly certified and acknowledged that the foregoing constitutes a true and accurate copy of the Order adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of the County of Durham at its meeting held January 6, 2003, as the same is taken from and compared with the recordation of said Order as Ordinance Number _____, on file in the Office of the Clerk to the Board of County Commissioners.

Witness my hand and notarial seal, this 17th day of January, 2003.

/s/ Susan B. Page
Notary Public

12/20/05
My Commissioner Expires

**Major Site Plan—New Elementary School “A”, Phase I—Ephesus Church Road
(Case D02-421)**

Coulter Jewell Thames, PA, on behalf of Durham Public Schools, has submitted a site plan for Phase I of a new elementary school, consisting of an 81,385 square-foot, one- and two-story elementary school, with 138 motor vehicle and nine bicycle parking spaces on a ±17.48 acre portion of a ±37.46 acre site. The proposed facility will be located on the southeastern corner of the intersection of Ephesus Church Road and George King Road (PIN 0709-03-12-9503; tax reference 485-2-8; County Atlas Page 85, Blocks A-3, A-4). Governing Body approval is required for proposed buildings larger than 25,000 square feet. A Traffic Impact Analysis has been reviewed for this development. An additional agenda item for a Major Special Use Permit (with a public hearing) for this site must be approved prior to consideration of this Major Site Plan.

Resource Person(s): Frank M. Duke, AICP, Planning Director

County Manager’s Recommendation: If appropriate, the County Manager recommends that the Board suspend the rules and approve the site plan.

City-County Planning Director, Frank Duke, introduced the item. He stated that the required Major Special Use Permit was authorized by the Board just previous to this agenda item. All of the conditions required by Durham County’s Code of Ordinances for the site plan have been satisfied, given the existing zoning and the proposed use.

Chairman Reckhow asked if the site plan allowed for restrooms in the area of the gymnasium which would be accessible from outside the building. The applicant answered that this had not been addressed in the design. He said this could be amended with two single-fixture, exterior access bathrooms as long as it does not change the building schedule at this point.

A discussion followed regarding providing road width to accommodate a bicycle lane. Chairman Reckhow said she would like for Planning staff and Transportation staff to work to develop guidelines to set standards regarding a plan for bike lanes and sidewalks along our roadways to make them multi-modal. That is the goal of the plan.

Commissioner Heron moved, seconded by Commissioner Jacobs, to approve the Major Site Plan (Case D02-421) with the change to add one exterior unisex bathroom.

The motion carried with the following 4-1 vote:

Ayes: Cousin, Heron, Jacobs, and Reckhow

Noes: Bowser

Planning Director Frank Duke advised that the UDO is considering changes to the development standards regarding the cross-standards. This would address the bike lane width concern.

Little River Regional Park and Natural Area Update

The 391-acre Little River Regional Park and Natural Area, which is jointly owned by Durham and Orange counties, is currently in the final design and development stages. The final site plan is anticipated for BOCC approval in late January or early February. The design and construction phase is funded primarily by a \$262,000 Land and Water Conservation Fund Grant. The firm Haden-Stanziale has been hired to design the Park entrance, access, parking, and other infrastructures. They have been working with staff, the Little River Park Advisory Board, and the public in the design for the Park entrance facilities.

Due to the joint management and administration of the park's overall use, functions, design, interlocal agreements etc., the timeline for the opening of the Park is anticipated for late summer or early fall of 2003 at the earliest. The anticipated timeline for this process is attached. Staff is currently finalizing a draft interlocal agreement for consideration by the Orange and Durham County Boards for approval in late January.

The design phase has included input from the Advisory Board as well as input from citizens at an October 29, 2002 public review of the conceptual plan for the park. The site plan also includes the relocation of a house in Orange County to the Park for a resident manager/caretaker structure as agreed to by both Boards.

Resource Person(s): Frank M. Duke, AICP, Planning Director; Mike Giles, Open Space Land Manager

County Manager's Recommendation: Accept the Little River Regional Park update and recommendations.

Mr. Mike Giles, the Open Space Land Manager, updated the Commissioners on the progress of the site plan for the Little River Regional Park and Natural Area. He informed those unfamiliar with the plan that it is a joint project between Durham and Orange Counties, the Eno River Association, and the Triangle Land Conservancy. The park consists of 391 acres, with its entrance in Orange County. The site plan involves 15 acres; the other 376 acres are being developed by staff and volunteers into walking trails, mountain bike trails, and equestrian trails.

The site plan encompasses an asphalt entrance road, a traffic circle, 30 parking spaces, two small picnic shelters, a restroom, an informal play area, a handicap-accessible asphalt nature trail, and three trail heads (for walkers, bikers, and equestrians).

Mr. Giles stated that NCDOT assistance had been requested to help with funding a left-turn lane into the park. He related that the goal was for the final site plan to be placed

before the Board for approval in late February, bidding for construction to be completed by late March or April, construction finished in midsummer, and to have the park open to the public by fall.

Commissioner Heron praised the bike trail and equestrian trail volunteers for their willingness to help construct the trails. This will speed up their completion.

Mr. Giles added that the interlocal agreement would be forthcoming as soon as Orange County contacts have signed it. Also to be provided to the Board will be a joint budget between Orange of Durham Counties.

Chairman Reckhow related her thanks to Mr. Giles for the work done on this project. Mr. Giles advised that an access easement (on Durham County land) would be addressed once the survey for the road is done.

No action was required on this item.

Triangle J Cable Regulatory Consortium

Triangle J Council of Governments (TJCOG) has formed the Triangle J Cable Regulatory Consortium (Cable Consortium), made up of local governments, to assist members in addressing their cable television and telecommunication responsibilities. The Cable Consortium advocates for and protects the public interest in the regulation and development of cable communications systems in the Triangle J Region and its member local governments; monitors and helps resolve cable subscribers' concerns in these jurisdictions; and participates in the planning and implementation of community use of communications technologies which make use of the public right-of-way. TJCOG has secured the expertise of Mr. Robert F. Sepe of Action Audits, LLC, as a contractor with substantial knowledge and experience in cable television administration, regulatory, franchising, licensing, public access television management, and right-of-way enforcement matters necessary for local governments to assert their regulatory authority and protect the public interest. Durham County is currently facing an unregulated increase in its cable fees

As detailed in Exhibit A, the annual membership rate is \$5,000 for member governments. Durham recently paid \$1,000 to TJCOG for assistance with the Effective Competition Claim filed by Time Warner Cable Company. Given that contribution, the joining fee for Durham County is \$4,000. For Durham County to become a member of the Cable Consortium and receive the services detailed in Exhibit B, it is necessary to enter into a contract with TJCOG, at which point services will become available immediately.

Resource Person(s): Lowell Siler, Deputy County Attorney; Robert Sepe, Technical Consultant for the Triangle J Cable Regulatory Consortium; Renee Boyette, Member Services Director, Triangle J Council of Governments.

County Manager's Recommendation: The County Manager recommended that the Board of County Commissioners approve membership in the Triangle J Cable Regulatory Consortium. This item would be placed on the January 13, 2003 Consent Agenda.

County Manager Mike Ruffin commented that this item was in direct response to the Board's request that administration research whether joining the consortium might be advisable.

Deputy County Attorney Lowell Siler advised that about 20 other jurisdictions in TJCOG are currently working with Action Audits LLC to ensure they are doing their part in dealing with provision of cable services. Action Audits LLC has helped to decipher Time Warner Cable Company's detailed and complicated requests for audits, rate increases, etc.

Deputy County Attorney Siler reported that Durham County had already entered into an agreement with TJCOG and Action Audits LLC to handle another issue, and that its service was impressive. Mr. Siler stated he felt that Action Audits LLC would do well in assisting the County with other cable issues.

The Commissioners asked questions of Renee Boyette, Member Services Director, TJCOG, to which she responded.

During Commissioner discussion, County Attorney Kitchen advised that the current franchise ordinance for Durham County is lacking in enforcement ability. It is due for renewal in 2005. Ms. Boyette advised that, if the Board approves membership in the consortium, the franchise ordinance could be reviewed and recommendations could be made to improve the enforcement areas of the franchise before it is renewed.

Ms. Boyette, at Chairman Reckhow's request, agreed to contact Mr. Sepe of Action Audits LLC to determine whether the membership cost could be reduced since the period covered would be only six months instead of a full year.

In answer to Chairman Reckhow's question, Ms. Renee Boyette advised that the cable company had not been able to justify its rate increase of 6-7 percent.

The Commissioners discussed the housing density requirement for service under the current franchise ordinance, which leaves out many county residents. New standards would be addressed in the franchise renewal process.

No action was necessary at this meeting. This item would be placed on the January 13, 2003 Regular Session agenda.

Closed Session

The Board was requested to adjourn to closed session to preserve the attorney-client privilege, to give instructions to an attorney concerning the handling of claims and

judicial actions, and to consider the performance of a public officer pursuant to N.C.G.S. § 143-318.11(a)(3) and (6).

Resource Person(s): Chuck Kitchen, County Attorney

Commissioner Jacobs moved, seconded by Commissioner Heron, to adjourn to closed session to preserve the attorney-client privilege, to give instructions to an attorney concerning the handling of claims and judicial actions, to discuss *Cabarrus versus Tolson* No. 02 CVS 12518, and to consider the performance of a public officer pursuant to N.C.G.S. § 143-318.11(a)(3) and (6).

The motion carried unanimously.

The Board adjourned into Closed Session at 12:30 p.m.

Reconvene Into Open Session

The Board of County Commissioners reconvened the Worksession. There was no action taken as a result of the Closed Session.

Progress Report—Local Business Plan for The Durham Center

North Carolina's mental health reform plan, generally known as the *State Plan*, calls for major changes about how public mental health/developmental disability/substance abuse services (MH/DD/SAS) are structured at the local level.

The plan specifies the creation of a *Local Management Entity* (LME) that is responsible for managing services and that is separate from a private provider network of community-based organizations and that will provide the services and supports. In Durham, the LME will be a new department of County government. The *State Plan* requires the LME to assure that anyone can receive basic core services, such as screening, assessment, emergency triage, and prevention, but otherwise to focus services to those most in need of service, specified by the state as the *target population*.

The *State Plan* calls for each local area program to submit a detailed written plan, called a *Local Business Plan* (LBP), detailing how the LME and provider network will work. The LBP is to be created in the context of a strategic plan, i.e. a plan for the transition of the current system to the new system. The LBP is due to the State on April 1, 2003.

The document attached is a progress report of Durham's LBP which provides a summary of the process and current design and is a report of efforts to date. Over 150 different individuals have participated in development of the draft plan. In December 2002, the Area Board of MH/DD/SAS approved the progress report for submission to the State. County government staff has reviewed the report and made changes, which are indicated in bold type.

Resource Person(s): Ellen Holliman, Interim Area Director, The Durham Center; Carolyn P. Titus, Deputy County Manager

County Manager's Recommendation: The County Manager recommended that the Board receive the presentation on the progress report and provide feedback and direction to staff. The Board's approval is not required for the Area Board to submit the Progress Report to the State.

Deputy County Manager Carolyn Titus made opening remarks. The Mental Health Local Management Entity (LME) will become a County department as of July 1, 2004. The state-required local business plan is due April 1, 2003. An interim report, also required by the state, was submitted here today before the Commissioners for information and an opportunity for input. It is a work in progress; many facets of the plan are unknown and are thus not set. There will be time in the next year to make more revisions as more information is known.

Chairman Reckhow asked Ellen Holliman, Interim Area Director for The Durham Center, to give an overview of the progress report on the plan that is due in April 2003. The progress report is a framework on which the final plan will be developed. The process, developed by the state, is very prescriptive. The timelines established are under General Statute. That is why the plan is being submitted, even though there are informational gaps—which can be filled in with revisions during the next year.

Ms. Holliman introduced the project team members Bill Hussey and Tom Stevens, who have helped with facilitation of the project, and Jack Ramsey from MH adult services.

Ms. Holliman progressed through a series of slides in her progress report. The local business plan is centered on real, human needs as opposed to system needs. The plan is to be consumer-centered, and explains the framework as to how the LME will work along with the provider network. The plan is being created in the context of a strategic plan aimed at the transition from the current system of services to the new one. Reform calls for a transition from an Area Mental Health Program—consisting of administration, services and programs, and contact services—to a system of services that includes a Local Management Entity (LME) and a provider network. The new system will provide for multiple portals of entry, whereas the current system has only one entry portal.

Ms. Holliman stated that funding for some areas may change. Future funding sources will determine what services can be provided.

Commissioner Heron thanked Ms. Holliman for this very well written and easily understood report. Chairman Reckhow stated she was impressed by the report and wished the group much luck in the finalization of the local business plan over the next several months. She stated she was glad for the inclusion of the public in this process.

No action was required on this item.

Adoption of Legislative Goals

The Board was requested to consider adopting legislative goals to present to the Durham County Legislative Delegation for consideration during the upcoming session of the General Assembly. As was done last year, the Board was asked to determine its priority legislative items, those legislative items it is seeking the Delegation to introduce, and those legislative items it is supporting. After this is completed by the Board, the staff will construct a legislative package for the Board's presentation to the Delegation at a later meeting.

Legislative items, which the Board may wish to consider, were distributed. This includes drafted bills for some potential legislative items, selected legislative goals from the North Carolina Association of County Commissioners, a complete list of the legislative goals from the North Carolina Association of County Commissioners as adopted by the Board of Directors of the Association for presentation at the Legislative Goals Conference, and requested legislative items from the Department of Social Services and Health Departments.

Resource Person(s): Deborah Craig-Ray, Public Information Director; Chuck Kitchen, County Attorney

County Manager's Recommendation: Select the priority, seek, and support legislative goals so that the Staff can prepare a legislative package.

Chairman Reckhow advised that there might be additional items coming forth in the next couple of weeks from the Durham Crime Cabinet, concerning strengthening gun use laws for this community.

County Attorney Chuck Kitchen introduced the agenda item. These legislative goals were presented for the Board to consider their adoption for presentation to the legislative delegation. The Board was also asked to choose its priority goals. Ms. Deborah Craig-Ray will set a meeting of the Durham County Legislative Delegation and the County Commissioners to go over the goals. After today's meeting, a document will be prepared to present to our legislators.

The Commissioners discussed examining the City's legislative goals list to check for overlapping items. A meeting possibly could be set with City Council to go over the items in common.

The County Attorney reviewed the items for the Commissioners to determine their support for each item. The Commissioners agreed to support bills to accomplish the following:

- To allow Dare County to create special districts to raise funds to place utility lines underground

- To allow juveniles to be photographed by a detention facility or a local confinement facility for release when a juvenile escapes
- To allow the holding of a juvenile in a local confinement facility while awaiting trial as an adult
- To allow County appeal in juvenile “pay order” cases
- To make escape from a juvenile detention facility a crime (set as a Class 1 misdemeanor)
- To prohibit allowing juveniles to escape (set as a Class 1 misdemeanor)
- To authorize Durham County to levy a tax on land development to pay part of the costs of school capital facilities (impact fee)
- NCACC goals: Medicaid relief, Long-term care reform, Latino issues, human services agencies, local government finance options, legislative restrictions on withholding of funds, sales tax exceptions, public duty doctrine, economic development and growth management strategy, elections supervisors and employees, increase school nursing ratio, service of process fee, and the Criminal Justice Partnership Act.

Chairman Reckhow suggested that the County Manager write a letter to Duke University President, Dr. Nannerl Koehane. The letter would state that neither the golf course nor the Washington Duke Hotel is paying property taxes, and that the Board respectfully requests that Duke make a payment in lieu of taxes equivalent to what would be paid on the hotel based on its assessed value. If Duke does not agree to do that by an established date, the Board would plan to pursue a legislation change to tax the hotel.

County Attorney Kitchen was asked to move these forward and continue to do the staff work.

The County Commissioners chose six priority goals from the list for this legislative session. The six top priority goals follow:

- Juvenile code revisions
- Impact fees
- Local government finance program
- Medicaid relief
- Latino issues
- Long-term care improvement

Commissioner Liaison Appointments

The Board of Commissioners considered the appointment of its members to act as liaisons to various other boards and commissions. The list of current appointments and the list of boards and commissions were provided. The Board members were asked to give a list of their preferences to the Clerk for submission to Chairman Reckhow. The recommended appointments would be presented at the meeting.

County Manager's Recommendation: Suspend the rules and approve the appointments as decided by the Board.

Chairman Reckhow asked the Clerk to the Board to send out notices of these appointments as quickly as possible to inform staff which Commissioner is serving as liaison so that appropriate materials can be sent to them.

Vice-Chairman Bowser moved, seconded by Commissioner Cousin, to suspend the rules of procedure to allow for a vote on the Commissioner liaison appointments.

The motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Cousin moved, seconded by Vice-Chairman Bowser, to approve the Commissioner liaison appointments as listed.

The motion carried unanimously.

COMMISSIONER LIAISON ASSIGNMENTS
TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS (JANUARY, 2003)

Commissioner Bowser

1. Library Board
2. Durham City County Committee
3. Social Services Board
4. Lincoln Community Health Center
5. Operation Breakthrough Board
6. Triangle Transit Authority (effective November 2003)
7. Criminal Justice Partnership Act Board
8. Convention and Visitors Bureau Board

Commissioner Cousin

1. North Carolina Museum of Life and Science
2. Durham Public Schools (Liaison)
3. Durham City/County Committee (Alternate)
4. Durham Arts Council Board
5. Durham City/County Planning Committee
6. Triangle Transit Authority Tax Board
7. Downtown Durham Inc. (7/01/02 to 6/30/03)

Commissioner Jacobs

1. Public Health Board
2. Hospital Corporation Board of Trustees
3. Farmland Protection Board
4. Triangle Transit Authority Tax Board
5. Special Airport District Board
6. Community Child Protection Team
7. Carolina Theatre Board
8. Durham City/County Committee (Alternate)
9. Durham City/County Planning Committee (Alternate)

Commissioner Heron

1. Durham Central Park
2. Durham-Chapel Hill-Orange Work Group
3. Durham City/County Committee
4. Durham City/County Planning Committee
5. Durham County Sheriff's Department (Liaison)
6. Durham-Wake Work Group (Alternate)
7. Little River Park Advisory Committee
8. Special Airport District Board
9. Triangle J Council of Governments Smart Growth Committee
10. Transportation Advisory Committee
11. Upper Neuse River Basin Association
12. Animal Control Advisory Committee
13. Juvenile Crime Prevention Council
14. Memorial Stadium Authority
15. Triangle J Council of Governments (Alternate)
16. Little River Regional Parkland and Natural Area Work Group

Commissioner Reckhow

1. Durham City/County Committee
2. Durham City/County Planning Committee
3. Chamber of Commerce Board
4. Durham-Wake Work Group
5. Durham-Chapel Hill-Orange Work Group
6. Transportation Advisory Committee (Alternate)
7. Triangle J Council of Governments
8. Triangle J Council of Governments Smart Growth Committee
9. Triangle Transit Authority (until November 2003)
10. Durham Open Space and Trails Commission
11. Mental Health Board
12. Durham Comprehensive Plan Steering Committee
13. Little River Regional Parkland and Natural Area Work Group

Chairman Reckhow remarked that some meetings of these boards and commissions were coming up soon. Chairman Reckhow asked the Clerk to the Board to contact

Commissioner Jacobs and Planning Director Frank Duke to advise them regarding upcoming meetings and Commissioner materials needed.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Garry E. Umstead, CMC
Clerk to the Board

GEU:SBP