

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA)
)
COUNTY OF STOKES)
)

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONERS
STOKES COUNTY GOVERNMENT
DANBURY, NORTH CAROLINA
MARCH 2, 2012

The Board of Commissioners of the County of Stokes, State of North Carolina, met for a Special Recessed Meeting (recessed from the February 23rd meeting) with Pilot View Resource Conservation & Development in the Third Floor Conference Room of the Ronald Wilson Reagan Memorial Building (Administration Building) located in Danbury, North Carolina on Friday, March 2, 2012 at 12:00 noon with the following members present:

Chairman Ernest Lankford
Vice Chairman J. Leon Inman
Commissioner Jimmy Walker
Commissioner Ronda Jones
Commissioner James D. Booth

County Personnel in Attendance:
Clerk to the Board Darlene Bullins
Finance Director Julia Edwards
Support Services Supervisor Danny Stovall
Public Works Director Mark Delehant
Economic Development Director Alan Wood
County Attorney Edward Powell

Pilot View RC&D in Attendance:
Executive Director Charles Anderson
Project Administrator Debbie Dodson
Senior Proj. Manager Don Hunley, Michael Baker Engineering, Inc.

Stokes Director Ann Watts, Forsyth Tech

Chairman Ernest Lankford called the recessed meeting to order.

Chairman Lankford noted that County Manager Rick Morris would be attending today's meeting via conference call due to an illness.

Chairman Lankford noted the objective of the first part of meeting would be to have discussion between the members of the Board before representatives from Pilot View RC &D (Pilot

View) arrived regarding the following:

- (1) Whether the Board wishes to pursue the project outlined in the proposed agreement
- (2) Whether the Board wishes to pursue the proposed agreement with Pilot View which includes Phase I - \$373,113 for project design
- (3) Whether the Board wishes to approve \$30,000 upfront retainer fee per the proposed agreement

Manager Morris noted the Board needs to make sure the following are discussed and clearly understood by everyone:

- Phase I which requires the BOCC to pay Pilot View an amount not to exceed \$373,113 for project design unless grants are received
- Phase II which includes the \$30,000 up front retainer fee which will be deducted from the \$373,113 fee
- Pilot View billing monthly for work performed for the remainder of the \$373,113 fee
- Twelve (12) percent of the construction cost payable to Pilot View
- Once the design is completed, bids could be procured in order to determine the project cost
- Pilot View has already applied for a Clean Water Grant for Phase I which will possibly reduce the \$373,113 cost
- During Phase I, Pilot View will be seeking grant funding

Chairman Lankford confirmed with Manager Morris that once Phase I is completed, Pilot View can seek grant funding, if no funding is secured, the County can terminate the agreement.

Manager Morris reiterated that all these questions would need to be verified by Director Anderson.

Commissioner Booth questioned how the 12% fee was determined; is the fee negotiable?

Manager Morris responded:

- Believe the 12% fee is negotiable
- Fee is based on the scope and size of the project
- County currently pays 10% administration fee to a third party provider who handles the CBDG Scattered Site Housing Grant, which is not as complicated as this project will be
- Need clarification on the 12% fee from Director Anderson
- Feel the fee will mainly pay Pilot View to seek funding sources, seek and secure the permitting, and facilitate the planning and design of the project

- Could ask Director Anderson how much fee is being charged with the sewer project in Surry County

Commissioner Walker suggested asking Director Anderson what is the range of fees that Pilot View has charged for various projects?

Commissioner Walker questioned Manager Morris:

- What will the County be charged?
- Is the \$373,113 for design fee a negotiable figure?
- How does the \$30,000 up front retainer fee actually work?
- What else could the county be responsible for?
- What is the likely total projected expenditure for the County?

Manager Morris responded his understanding is as follows: (noted that these responses needed to be verified by Pilot View)

- The \$373,113 is not negotiable
- County will be responsible for the \$373,113 if grants are not secured
- The \$30,000 retainer fee will be deducted from the \$373,113
- Feel the \$373,113 and the \$30,000 which is included in the \$373,113 will be all the county will be responsible for before construction starts
- Credit for the purchase of the land, tax increase for the community college, possible contribution from NCDOT can be used for leveraging funding
- NCDOT could possibly contribute funding once an agreement is reached and the State can figure the savings they would incur by hooking on
- Estimated \$400,000 to \$500,000 could be a possible amount when meeting with NCDOT was held, funding would offset the total cost of the project

Commissioner Walker questioned if bids would be done by the County.

Manager Morris noted that Pilot View would be in charge of the project and selection of the engineering firm.

Vice Chairman Inman noted the following:

- Feels anything in dealing is negotiable
- 12% management fee is included in each phase
- Anti Trust Laws do not allow someone from saying this is our normal fee, 'can only say this is what I charge'
- This project could be \$5 to \$6 million dollars, just an estimate right now

Vice Chairman Inman confirmed with Manager Morris that the Phase I fee of \$373,113 includes Pilot View's 12% design fee and Pilot View would get 12% of the construction cost

in Phase II.

Vice Chairman Inman noted that he would be discussing the 12% fee with Director Anderson.

Commissioner Walker noted the 12% fee of the design phase is initially about the same as the additional amount that the septic would have cost.

Manager Morris noted the \$373,113 design fee includes water and sewer; if only sewer, the design fee would probably be less.

Vice Chairman Inman agreed with Manager Morris that funding from NCDOT could not be confirmed until an agreement is signed giving sewer rights, probably during Phase II.

Commissioner Walker confirmed with Manager Morris that payment from NCDOT would be received once a calculation savings is determined.

Commissioner Walker questioned what is NCDOT status with water?

Chairman Lankford noted that the County furnishes NCDOT with water from the Early College location.

Mr. Danny Stovall confirmed that the County does supply NCDOT with water in exchange for a property easement.

Public Works Director Mark Delehant noted that the agreement requires payment if NCDOT consumes over a certain amount of water; at the current time, NCDOT has not gone over that amount.

Commissioner Jones noted the only question that she has right now is to clarify the percent rate with Director Anderson.

Commissioner Booth mentioned there could be a possible 20% partnership match for the construction cost.

Commissioner Booth noted the possibility of not being able to use the \$250,000 that

was allocated by Legislation for the design phase.

Vice Chairman Inman noted that Representative Holloway is working on that issue.

Manager Morris noted the funding for the \$373,113 and \$30,000 is available from the sewer fund and remaining funds from the Nancy Reynolds Project and that the bond attorney had confirmed that the remaining funds from the Nancy Reynolds Project could be used.

Manager Morris noted the remaining funds from the Nancy Reynolds Project can only be used directly for the community college, can't be used for any connection to the Meadows area.

Commissioner Walker questioned if there would be any issues if leftover funding from the Nancy Reynolds Project was used to connect to the community college and private citizens/businesses hooked on.

Manager Morris did not feel that would be a problem, but would want more clarification from the bond attorney.

Commissioner Walker stated that he would not want the county to get involved in legal issues over the questionable use of funds.

Chairman Lankford questioned Mr. Stovall and Director Delehant, with their experience, if the \$373,113 cost to perform the design phase is realistic, high/low?

Director Delehant and Mr. Stovall both stated that Mr. Hunley, Baker Engineering, mainly wanted background information and to look at specific areas of the property. Director Delehant stated that he believed that Mr. Hunley actually got the \$373,113 figure from the Hobbs and Upchurch planning grant and the proposed agreement states the amount is not to exceed \$373,113.

The Board continued discussion regarding the \$30,000 retainer fee and if it will be deducted from the \$373,113. Chairman Lankford stated this will have to be cleared up by Director Anderson.

The Board discussed Pilot View being the one that would contract with an engineering

firm and if there would be no RFP for the design phase as previously discussed in the first meeting.

Mr. Stovall suggested requiring Pilot View to bid the project.

Commissioner Walker agreed that competition is healthy.

Manager Morris noted:

- Director Anderson needs to explain the advantages of having an RC&D do this versus the County or bidding out the services to other providers

Commissioner Booth noted that once an agreement is signed, Pilot View will take control of the entire project.

Manager Morris noted that these were all good questions for Director Anderson to help us explain to the citizens why it was done this way.

Commissioner Walker noted that he had already been questioned about spending more for this project than it would have cost to do it on site, will possibly be looked at by citizens in the County.

Mr. Stovall noted the following:

- Understand the goal is for a 600 student capacity facility for Forsyth Tech
- Understand POD A and POD B stays
- Right now, capacity for each POD during the day is 184 with 100 students at night
- Feel it will be really hard to find enough dirt to put septic in the ground for 1,000 students
- There will have to be a cafeteria on the premises
- Water will have to be upgraded with the estimated capacity
- Fire suppression system will have to be installed, will need a fire suppression tank

Chairman Lankford noted the tank on the prison property may be useable.

The Board discussed the capacity and square footage of the facility being considered.

The Board discussed the projected 600 student capacity, which will not be at the proposed facility at one time, with Director Ann Watts, Forsyth Tech.

Commissioner Booth confirmed with Mr. Stovall that at the current time, the two sewer systems located on the community college site have sewer capacity for 380 and that 300 students

will be added when the new facility is built.

The Board discussed the state requirements for sewer with Mr. Stovall.

Mr. Stovall noted the state looks at sewer capacity as the number that will be at the facility during a 24- hour period.

Commissioner Walker noted that one decision that was made by this Board when the second POD was added was whether to install a large or small system to the existing system and this Board approved to go with the smaller system anticipating that sewer would be run to the site.

Mr. Stovall stated if the Board chose to upgrade the existing septic system; there would have to be a 100% repair area on the site which might be very difficult to find.

Director Watts noted that if more of the property is used for septic, that would limit expansion of other programs.

Representatives from Pilot View entered the meeting.

Director Anderson noted the following:

- Need to go through the agreement process
- County has lost some opportunities in the past
- Feels this is an opportunity now to get a community college in Stokes County
- Need to take advantage of this opportunity to get a community college in Stokes County even if water and sewer is not completed
- This is an opportunity for the citizens of Stokes County to be educated beyond high school in Stokes County
- Water and sewer on the site will allow the community college to expand
- Opportunities are lost when there is no room for expansion
- With a campus coming in, the Meadows area is going to change

Director Anderson started the discussion regarding the proposed agreement:

- Have already applied for a Clean Water Grant to offset some of the cost of the design phase if approved
- Have already started networking to set the stage for the project
- Pilot View has had a long partnership with Baker Engineering
- This project is a little different, at this time in the process, an agreement would have already been signed

- Traditionally, we wait until the grants are approved, then sign an agreement with Baker Engineering for design and permitting, then we start seeking grant dollars
- Did not want to lose opportunities due to deadlines
- Prefer to have design and permitting in place before seeking grant dollars
- The cost of this project is estimated from the Hobbs and Upchurch documentation
- Will not make any further applications until an agreement is in place
- This is not Pilot View's project, it is the County's project
- Pilot View is just the instrument to help put the project on the ground
- The County determines the timetable of the project
- My question to the Board of Commissioners is: "What is your schedule and how do you want to move forward?"

Vice Chairman Inman questioned how the Board feels about moving forward; need to know if the Board wishes to move forward with water and sewer?

Chairman Lankford noted the need to get a few questions answered before making any decisions.

Vice Chairman Inman reiterated the need to see if a majority of the Board wants to move forward with water and sewer to the Meadows site or upgrade the existing septic system on the site.

Chairman Lankford stated he would like the unanswered questions previously discussed by the Board to be answered before making any decision.

Commissioner Walker agreed that the unanswered questions need to be answered before moving forward.

Chairman Lankford requested Vice Chairman Inman to start the questions.

Vice Chairman Inman requested Mr.Hunley to explain the design figures (\$373,113).

Mr.Hunley responded:

- Basically looked at the work, didn't review in depth, but felt comfortable with the cost supplied by Hobbs and Upchurch
- Actually did some costs that came in very close (a little higher) to the ones figured by Hobbs and Upchurch and decided to go with the calculation from Hobbs and Upchurch

Vice Chairman Inman requested Director Anderson to explain the \$373,113 and the \$30,000 retainer fee.

Director Anderson responded:

- The \$30,000 is a retainer fee that will be deducted from the \$373,113
- The \$373,311 is the dollar amount that Baker has submitted which includes the 12% fee for Pilot View along with a contingency of approximately \$15,000 to \$20,000
- \$373,311 gets you a design and permits for the project
- So far, have been operating in good faith

Commissioner Jones requested explanation of the 12% fee in Phase II.

Director Anderson responded:

- The 12% is a standard board fee which is usually higher
- Pilot View's Board wants to start looking a 15% fee
- The 12% fee could come from the grants
- Grantor may not give funding for that purpose
- Some grantors only give funding for construction
- Some grantors do not want to pay for design or permitting
- Most all of the funders are different, none being the same
- Ultimately, the 12% fee is the county's responsibility if funding is secured for the fee

Vice Chairman Inman requested Director Anderson to expand on the project.

Director Anderson responded:

- Look at the total project, whatever it takes to have Forsyth Tech walk in the door and bring in 600 students
- Discussed scenarios how leveraging of funds and in-kind can determine what amount the county may be responsible for
- Very hard to find brick and mortar dollars
- Funding is always there, has always been there, and always will be there, it depends on who goes after the funding and who gets the funding
- Don't look to the manager and myself to do the work for you, it is all of us pulling together to make the project successful – it is a team effort
- Task Force will be formed that will meet on a regular basis to make sure that everyone is focused and the project is on line
- Members of the task force will inform others of where the project is
- The request we are working on is for water and sewer
- Looking at the total project to leverage the funding
- Most of the funding is reimbursable dollars, spend it, apply for it and then get it back
- It is a very hard task seeking funding

Chairman Lankford confirmed with Director Watts that the federal government was going to make funding (approximately \$10 billion) available to community colleges for programs, not brick and mortar.

Director Anderson confirmed the federal funding was for extending educational programs for retooling America.

Director Anderson provided the Board with information regarding Resource Institute:

- (501)(c) nonprofit that Pilot View and another RC&D started in 1999/2000 to go out for more grant dollars and to look at projects on a wider scale
- Has the same staff as Pilot View, but started with two different boards
- Recently the boards combined and formed one organization
- Over the next 12-18 months, the board will shift most of its projects over to one entity
- This will not make any difference to the county

Director Anderson requested to provide the following information before any other discussion:

- Need to review the Hobbs and Upchurch study
- Need to look at the Engineering Design Services prepared by Baker Engineering
- Resource Institute has made a grant request to Cleanwater on behalf of the county in the amount of \$264,400 for design and permitting
- Will not hear from the grant until September with final approval until October
- Can't spend any of those dollars before approval
- Needed to meet the deadline on the Clean Water Grant even though no agreement was signed
- Feels there is a good chance the grant will come through
- Need to look at the total dollars needed and how to get them

Commissioner Walker noted that brick and mortar had not been mentioned before today and questioned Director Anderson what does the County need to ask for in this project and what funding might be available for this project?

Director Anderson responded:

- Pilot View staff first looks at the project to determine what the total project consist of
- Pilot View does not always buy into all projects
- Pilot View staff makes sure the project is viable

- If viable, the project is then taken to the Pilot View Board for approval which has been done
- Get an assumption of costs
- Need solid numbers to get started so you know what amount you are going for
- If the Board decides to go forth with the project, would suggest to Forsyth Tech that an architect be hired to design the building to know the exact cost
- Need to know what the Board of Commissioners wants Pilot RC&D to do
- Leveraging is the key factor in obtaining grant funding
- Never start a project until the money is in hand

Commissioner Booth noted that the project presented to the RC&D Board was initially just sewer, did not include the community college or water.

Commissioner Walker questioned Director Anderson, in his professional opinion, what would Pilot View want to ask for – the entire project including the community college facility, water and sewer, or sewer only.

Director Anderson responded:

- Always like to look at the big picture
- There is never a guarantee for funding
- Going to include the big picture to leverage funding for the project
- Will not worry about the funding for the community college because that is not what Pilot View has been asked to do
- Could possibly use the 4 cent tax already dedicated to build the community college for leveraging funding for the water and sewer

Commissioner Booth confirmed with Director Anderson that on a \$5 million project, the county could be responsible for \$1 million, part of the million or none; all depends on the funders.

Director Anderson reiterated that he would use anything related to the project for leveraging.

Vice Chairman Inman confirmed with Director Anderson the agreement the Board is considering is only for water and sewer.

Commissioner Booth also confirmed that the project being considered is for water and sewer only.

Commissioner Walker confirmed with Director Anderson that it is always easier to scale

back than to add to a project.

Commissioner Walker noted that it was a very good point to ask for it all as long as it didn't delay time.

Vice Chairman Inman confirmed with Director Anderson that if this Board wants to include the community college, a new agreement would need to be executed to include the estimated cost of the community college.

Director Anderson urged the Board not to worry about the 12% fee; if you get grant funding, there might be enough to cover the 12% fee.

Commissioner Walker questioned Director Anderson, if the Board decided to include the community college, could the 12% fee be lowered?

Director Anderson noted the project would have to be taken back to the Board for consideration, not sure what the Board would do.

Vice Chairman Inman confirmed the following with Director Anderson:

- If this Board contracts for the estimated \$5 million for water and sewer, you can use the other items such land purchase, POD purchase, septic system for leveraging

Mr. Stovall confirmed with Director Anderson that most grants have a deadline to secure the funding.

Director Anderson reiterated the need for Forsyth Tech to get an architect on board to get this project moving.

Commissioner Booth suggested putting something together to make sure everyone knows what we are doing.

Director Anderson stated it is time to put the puzzle together.

Director Anderson reiterated that Pilot View always looks at the big picture, but will only do what is requested by this Board.

Director Anderson noted that funds are out there, but funds are tight right now

Director Anderson stated the following:

- Pilot View does not guarantee the funds, it is a team effort
- Very few dollars for brick and mortar

Chairman Lankford confirmed with County Attorney Ed Powell that he reviewed the proposed agreement.

County Attorney Powell noted:

- Believe the contract is good
- Contains flexibility giving the County and Pilot View options to terminate if needed
- If no funding was obtained, the most invested would be the \$373,311, but would have a plan on the shelf to use later
- Does not tie the County's hands to make adjustments if needed

Chairman Lankford confirmed with County Attorney Powell that the wording on page 9-item 10 does not mean the County would have to pay Pilot View's attorney fees if the County pulled out of the project.

County Attorney Powell stated it would only be if there was a breach of contract and either side had to force the part of the agreement that had not been completed.

Chairman Lankford confirmed with Director Anderson that Pilot View would be using Baker Engineering.

Manager Morris requested to clarify a few things with Director Anderson.

- Page 1 – failing septic systems – Environmental Health Supervisor did not want to send the impression that there are failing systems in the area that have not been fixed – the one system that has failed, now has a permit to pump and haul which now is considered to not be a failing system

Director Anderson noted that was really a plus because there are systems that are not meeting the necessary requirements for disposal of waste.

- Section 1 (b) – questioned if obtaining the easement would be a big deal for the county

Director Anderson noted that normally Pilot View gets the sponsor that knows the landowners to get the conservation easement and water/sewer easements. Director Anderson feels that between county staff and NCDOT, there should not be an issue.

Manager Morris noted that NCDOT Engineer John Rhyne informed the county that there is not a defined right of way; however, NCDOT already has the area that basically runs from the back slope of the ditches on each side where utilities are already there. Manager Morris noted that the County may only have to get an encroachment agreement between NCDOT and utilities.

Mr. Hundley noted that this was normal procedure.

Director Anderson noted that if the County ran into issues getting the easements, Pilot View can help to get the easement, but there would be a cost.

Manager Morris confirmed the following with Director Anderson:

- Agreement is approved by the Board of Commissioners and executed
- County will pay \$30,000 up front as a retainer fee
- Pilot View will then begin invoicing the County quarterly for work performed
- The last invoice will back out the \$30,000 paid up front by the County
- Not sure if conservation easements will be needed – should be no issues if needed
- Will not get into conservation easements unless funders require it

Commissioner Booth noted that there was some mention of going across private property, but confirmed with Mr. Hundley that there were other ways to not go across private property if issues arise; sometimes easements are not easy to get.

County Attorney Ed Powell noted:

- If additional easements are needed, the county perhaps would have to pay for the right to that easement to the property owner

Director Anderson noted that they tried to get most of the easements donated, but sometimes financial compensation is necessary to obtain the easement.

Commissioner Booth confirmed with Director Anderson that there should be no issues with easements with NCDOT.

March 2, 2012

Mr. Hundley noted that there was a NCDOT easement that would work if the private property owner mentioned earlier refused.

Manager Morris questioned if the County has authority to contract or go directly to contractors hired by Pilot View. (Attachment A- page 7 – Section 2)

Director Anderson stated:

- You can't contract with them directly; Pilot View will employ them for the County
- This is a team effort, everyone will be able to discuss issues in a team meeting
- That section means you can bring some type of civil suit against the contractor or the engineering firm, Pilot View will allow you to do this
- Pilot View is a 501(c) nonprofit here to help you, which you can't sue

Manager Morris questioned project safety mentioned on page 8.

Director Anderson responded:

- Contractor will have to perform to OSHA standards, not Pilot View
- Pilot View will probably ask the County to bid the project out once the funding is in place

Manager Morris noted Attachment C mentioned on page 8 should be Attachment B.

Manager Morris requested Director Anderson to explain Page – Section 8 – original performance materials are the property of their author.

Director Anderson responded:

- Original performance materials are the design which is a deliverable to the county
- General statements technically mean that Pilot View would not want the County to take a design that Baker did, put a different name on it, and sell it somewhere else

Mr. Hunley responded:

- Intellectual property – basically the County will have complete access and use of the design, but can't resell it

Manager Morris confirmed with Attorney Powell that he had no issues with the proposed agreement.

Commissioner Booth confirmed with Director Anderson that warranties will be included with the construction contract/bid package and that the proposed agreement had flexibility to

terminate.

Commissioner Booth presented this scenario for Director Anderson for clarification:

- Pilot View RC& D went out for the grant and found \$2 million instead of \$5 million for project
- County will have to make a decision at that point
- The 12% fee still goes on the \$5 million instead of the \$2 million

Attorney Powell noted that Pilot View will be able to collect their fees once a contractual agreement has been entered.

Commissioner Walker stated that would be a \$600,000 fee, along with the approximate \$373,113 for the design phase that the county could be responsible for.

Commissioner Walker also stated that this is a very complex issue – funding, easements, real estate which could be questioned if everything is not done right.

Director Anderson reiterated that Pilot View is working with the County.

County Attorney Powell noted if Pilot View has gotten to the point where they have rendered a contractual obligation to the County, the county owes the fee.

Commissioner Booth confirmed again with Director Anderson that the agreement is for Phase I and Phase II.

Director Anderson noted Pilot View is already working going towards the strategy to get the estimated \$5 million.

Director Anderson stated that he would like to wait for the numbers from Don, but can't afford to wait unless the County tells Pilot View to wait; if the county would like for Pilot View to wait in securing the funds, it is a different contract and possible funding could be lost as they become available.

Commissioner Walker noted:

- Not even that far along
- Basic decision right now is yes the county needs to do something

- Not on board with including the water in the project
- Leaning toward sewer
- Big question on water, can see asking for the amount to build in the fire suppression
- Not sure I can justify the project to just any citizen in the County, need to work on that some more
- Putting \$1 million into play, part to run water when there is a perfectly good well on site and likely to remain

Director Anderson responded

- How do you know you have a water supply good enough to supply the community college as well as the Meadows community where sewer will be run

Commissioner Walker responded:

- This is the question, are we trying to supply water to the Meadows community or are we trying to get a community college in place?
- Want to get the community college in place
- Haven't had any complaints regarding water from citizens or businesses along the way
- Seems the well on the Meadows site is as good or better than the wells in Danbury
- Have some processing to do as far as looking after the county's dollars
- Great to have the opportunity, but must balance the pieces
- County always has needs, could be the potential for another project for the near future

Director Anderson responded:

- The County must decide on whether the water needs to be included in the project
- If you asking for sewer, why not ask for water at the same time
- If you can't get enough funding for the water, it can be taken out down the road

Chairman Lankford noted the practicality that has been discussed to run water and sewer at the same time.

Commissioner Walker noted that everyone may not share the same opinion on trying to run water and sewer at the same time.

Finance Director Edwards confirmed that the 12% fee is based on the construction cost.

Mr. Stovall confirmed that there could be additional phases added to the agreement if funding is not available.

Director Anderson reiterated that you can only do what funding will provide, can't spend

funds that you don't have and most important the agreement is flexible.

The Board discussed different phases that could be done such as water and sewer to the community college first, then to the Meadows area at a later time.

Commissioner Jones noted:

- Makes no sense to do sewer and not do the water
- Common sense is to do both at the same time
- Just can't think about the community college, must think about economic development
- County has leverage
- 12% fee is solid
- Feel it is time to move forward

Vice Chairman Inman added to Commissioner Jones' comment:

- See this as a community college project
- If this project was a shopping center, you would get a foundation store such as Food Lion and then other stores
- In this case, the Food Lion is the community college
- What happens around this is fringe
- If we don't get the community college, there can't be anything else that will develop around the hub
- Very much in favor of economic development
- The anchor store is the community college
- Things will begin to happen around the community college
- Don't think it is responsible to depend solely on a septic system for the community college

Director Anderson noted how the growth started in King with water and sewer; that will happen in that area and there will be demand in that area.

Commissioner Walker suggested putting the item on the March 12th Action Agenda.

The Board discussed putting the item on the March 12th Action Agenda.

Commissioner Walker noted that he did not come to a work session prepared to make a final decision.

Director Anderson noted it is the Board's decision and should not be any issues with waiting until the March 12th meeting.

Manager Morris stated that he would provide the Board with a proposed Budget Amendment for funding the design phase and the upfront \$30,000 starting with appropriations from the sewer fund.

Director Anderson suggested that the County contact Forsyth Tech about an architect.

Manager Morris noted the need to get an answer regarding the \$250,000 appropriation and what it can be spent for since discussion had taken place regarding using it for the design phase. Manager Morris also noted that architect fees designing the facility could be paid from the 4 cent tax revenue – approved use of funding.

Director Ann Watts noted the need to make sure determination for use of funding be done before June 30, 2012; otherwise, it will have to go back to the State.

Director Anderson suggested that Forsyth Tech choose their firm which could take several months in order not to slow down the process.

The Board unanimously agreed to place the item on the March 12th Action Agenda.

Adjournment

There being no further business to come before the Board, Chairman Lankford entertained a motion to adjourn the recessed meeting.

Commissioner Jones moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Booth seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Darlene M. Bullins
Clerk to the Board

Ernest Lankford
Chairman