

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA )  
 )  
COUNTY OF STOKES )  
 )

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONERS  
STOKES COUNTY GOVERNMENT  
DANBURY, NORTH CAROLINA  
JUNE 10, 2013

The Board of Commissioners of the County of Stokes, State of North Carolina, met for regular session in the Commissioners' Chambers of the Ronald Wilson Reagan Memorial Building (Administration Building) located in Danbury, North Carolina on Monday, June 10, 2013 at 1:30 pm with the following members present:

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

County Personnel in Attendance:  
County Manager Richard D. Morris  
Clerk to the Board Darlene Bullins  
Finance Director Julia Edwards  
Tax Administrator Jake Oakley  
Sheriff Mike Marshall

Chairman Ernest Lankford called the meeting to order and welcomed those in attendance.

Chairman Lankford offered the following "Thought for the Day":

- "Then the eyes of those who see will no longer be closed and the ears of those who hear will listen"

Commissioner Inman delivered the invocation.

#### **GENERAL GOVERNMENT-GOVERNING BODY-PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

Chairman Lankford opened the meeting by inviting the citizens in attendance to join the Board in the Pledge of Allegiance.

#### **GENERAL GOVERNMENT – GOVERNING BODY – APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Chairman Lankford entertained a motion to approve or amend the June 10, 2013

Agenda.

June 10, 2013

County Manager Rick Morris requested the following:

- **Consent or Action Agent:** Budget Amendment #96 – Health Department – Funding needs to be transferred to Non-Capital Equipment from Departmental Supplies in order to receive equipment by July 1<sup>st</sup> for the prenatal clinic – only changing line item funding – no change in the dollar amount (Sense of Urgency)
- **Discussion Agenda:** Delete Item “D” – (Proposed Resolution – North Carolina Rural Center Grant Application) Proposed Resolution was not received from the Rural Center – should be placed back on the June 24<sup>th</sup> Agenda

The Board discussed adding Budget Amendment #96 to the Consent or Action Agenda.

Commissioner Walker confirmed with Manager Morris that the budget amendment was of the time sensitive nature.

Commissioner Inman confirmed with Manager Morris that there were no dollar amount changes to the current budget.

Commissioner Walker noted that most new items are not placed on the Consent Agenda.

The Board unanimously agreed to place Budget Amendment #96 on the Action Agenda in case there was needed discussion.

Vice Chairman Booth moved to approve the June 10<sup>th</sup> Agenda as amended.

Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

#### **COMMENTS - Manager/Commissioners**

Chairman Lankford opened the floor for comments from the Board and the County Manager.

Manager Rick Morris presented the following comments:

- **CDBG Grant** (Provided Board members with the required monthly report)
  - Status – only one house left to complete which should be finished in July
  - Once the last house is finished, the process to close the grant out will begin
- **Purchase of the Venable (Autumn Square) Building**
  - Approved by Local Government Commission on June 4<sup>th</sup>
  - Will be finalizing all documents to close on June 27<sup>th</sup>
  - Environmental Phase One was completed with no issues

- **Washington, DC – Water and Sewer Project**

- Was in Washington with Vice Chairman Booth and Charles Anderson, Pilot View, visiting Legislators/staff and the Economic Development Administration (Vice Chairman Booth will provide further information later in today's meeting)

Commissioner Jones commented:

- Recently attended a military funeral in Georgia for a Navy veteran
- Due to financial cuts, some of the military functions for funerals such as gun salutes are no longer being provided
- If you know of someone in need of military services for a funeral, contact the American Legion or VFW

Vice Chairman Booth commented:

- Talked with Congressman Coble and staff, Senator Burr's staff, and Senator Hagan's staff regarding the need for funding for the Water and Sewer Project to the community college site
- Also talked with the Economic Development Administration staff
- Feel they all know what we need and why

Chairman Lankford expressed appreciation to Vice Chairman Booth and Manager Morris for representing Stokes County and providing information to those in Washington regarding the need for funding for the Water and Sewer Project.

Commissioner Walker commented:

- Good to see those in attendance today, glad to see citizens taking part
- Hearing good comments about Arts Council events – really good comments heard about the recent musical presented by the Arts Council
- See this year is going to be one of the most challenging budgets that I have personally been involved
- County knew eventually Hold Harmless funding would exhaust, Hold Harmless funding is not included in the recommended budget from the manager
- Representative Holloway still working to try to restore the Hold Harmless – a glimmer of hope still there
- May have the challenge of putting a budget together without Hold Harmless
- Public Hearing for the proposed Budget is scheduled for Tuesday, June 11<sup>th</sup> at 7:00 pm in Courtroom "A"

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

There were no Public Comments.

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

Chairman Lankford entertained a motion to approve or amend the following items on the Consent Agenda:

### **Minutes**

- Minutes of March 22, 2013 – Special Meeting – Legislative Delegation
- Minutes of May 28, 2013 – Regular Meeting

### **Proposed Bids – Surplus Tax Foreclosed Properties**

County Manager Rick Morris presented the following proposed bids regarding the sale surplus tax foreclosed properties at the May 28<sup>th</sup> meeting with a request for approval at the June 10<sup>th</sup> meeting:

#### **Parcel 6989-00-42-5593**

- Parcel contains 5.91 acres
- Final bid from Mr. Raymond Martini of \$3,000.00

#### **Parcel 6989-00-42-9877**

- Parcel contains 7.82 acres
- Final bid from Mr. Raymond Martini of \$13,573.75

Commissioner Inman moved to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Vice Chairman Booth seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

## **GENERAL GOVERNMENT – GOVERNING BODY – INFORMATION AGENDA**

### **NCACC – Legislative – Video**

County Manager Rick Morris presented a NCACC Legislative Video which discussed the following topics:

- Expressed appreciation to those who were able to attend the recent County Assembly Day in Raleigh
- Over 200 county commissioners and staff were in Raleigh for County Assembly Day
- Very important to keep this momentum going forward
- Since the last update, Senate has passed their budget which has positive and negative aspects for counties

- For most part, Senate leaders did not pass down unfunded mandates to counties
- The Senate proposed \$100 million allocation of lottery funds for school construction
- Keep in mind, counties should receive \$180 million – this is a concern
- More concerning, however, is the elimination of the statutory guarantee that 40% of lottery proceeds go to county school capital funding, this will be an unwelcomed change
- There is another area that draws concern – provision that will start an unsettling precedent of making counties responsible for funding non county employee benefit costs
- In the Senate budget, counties will fund any shortfall in the volunteer firemen and rescue compensation payments, estimated to cost counties statewide \$6 million
- Need your help relaying these concerns to legislators
- Now it is the House's turn
- House budget writers have announced a three-week schedule that will conclude with a vote on the budget on June 13<sup>th</sup>, leaves only two weeks to approve a consensus budget between the House, the Senate and the Governor
- If an agreement is not reached, the Assembly must approve a continuing resolution, also known as a CR, before the end of fiscal year, June 30, 2013
- Advocacy Team has been working on the Legislative Goals
- One such goal will give specific counties the option to publish public notices on their websites and via emails instead of purchasing advertisements in newspapers (option)
- Due to significant pressure from the North Carolina Press Association, the bill has an uncertain future
- This situation needs every county to support one another
- Senate #321 – Contain Inmate Medical Cost – has passed the Senate; this bill will bring counties in line with state policy capping certain charges for inmate care
- If approved, Senate Bill #321 should provide significant savings for each county
- Please tell House members to support Senate Bill #321
- Another NCACC Legislative Goal making its way through legislative process is Senate Bill #236 – Counties Responsible for School Construction
- Originally, a statewide bill which now has been turned into a local bill impacting only counties that have requested the option
- Once the bill passes, these counties will have the option to have the responsibility to manage all aspects of the building process; it will also give counties the option of managing other functions such as maintenance agreements
- It is important to stress that our Association's strength in the Legislature rests in the our unity in supporting that counties have options; it is the main point stressed at the General Assembly
- The conversation regarding Tax Reform is getting more attention in Raleigh; however, a consensus plan between the House and the Senate still seems to be far away
- The House takes incremental approach:
  - Lowering corporate income tax
  - Flattening the personal income tax rate to 5.9%
  - Broadening the tax base to a limited number of services

- The Senate has two plans under consideration:
  - One of which will broaden the tax base significantly by taxing most services including health and professional services
  - Will lower the counties' sales tax rate
  - Modify the local sales tax distribution, but provide a traditional hold harmless for counties
  - It too would lower the personal and corporate income tax rates
- Still assessing the impacts to counties under all three plans; however, leaders have assured the Association that counties would be held harmless when it comes to revenue generation
- Will continue to be involved with this debate and will keep counties updated as things progress
- Appreciate the counties allowing this video to be played during a meeting

Chairman Lankford noted the decrease of last year's lottery impacted Stokes County approximately \$400,000 which hurts a small county like Stokes County.

Commissioner Inman commented:

- Talked with Representative Holloway last week
- House budget is almost complete
- Representative Holloway was to able get full funding for Hold Harmless in the House budget with the understanding there might have to be compromising with the Senate
- Representative Holloway stated it was a "bloody fight" to keep full funding in the House budget
- Spoke to Representative Holloway regarding the original language pertaining to lottery funds for construction and not putting those funds in the General Assembly which has been proposed by the Senate
- Received a text from Representative Holloway today:
  - The funding will remain at \$100 million and not the same as the Senate
- Concerns with the funding going into the General Assembly and used for other things like funding that was taken out of the Highway Trust Fund
- Know Representative Holloway will continue to work to try to keep the Hold Harmless funding

Commissioner Walker confirmed with Commissioner Inman that the Hold Harmless is not in the Senate budget.

Commissioner Jones also expressed concerns about the possibility of the statutorily 40% of lottery proceeds being completely removed; County counts on that funding.

Vice Chairman Booth reiterated the approximate \$400,000 noted by Chairman Lankford that

was lost last year; County is already having to make up this amount.

## GENERAL GOVERNMENT – GOVERNING BODY – DISCUSSION AGENDA

### Tax Administration Report – May 2013

Tax Administrator Jake Oakley presented the following informational data for the May Report:

Fiscal Year 2012-13	Budget Amt	Collected Amt	Over Budget	Under Budget
County Regular & Motor Vehicles	\$20,861,260.00	\$20,934,355.56		\$73,095.56
New Schools F-Tech Fund	\$1,390,751.00	\$1,399,225.03		\$8,474.03

#### Prior Taxes 1993-2011 Tax Years

County Regular & Motor Vehicles	\$675,000.00	\$801,206.57	\$126,206.57
---------------------------------	--------------	--------------	--------------

#### EMS Current Collections

<b>Total Collected</b> (05-01-13/05-31-13)	\$104,354.86
---	--------------

Total Collected (07-01-12/06-30-13)	\$1,251,343.27
--	----------------

#### Delinquent EMS Collection Report

<b>Total Collected</b> (05-01-13/05-31-13) \$13,973.02 (07-01-12/06-30-13) \$156,268.64
---

#### Personal Property Discovery Report

Audit Dates	# of Accts	Total	Taxes Due
05-01-13/05-31-13	9	\$38,116.00	\$329.90
07-01-12/06-30-13	1,536	\$11,050,005.00	\$96,531.00

#### Business Personal Property Discovery Report

Audit Dates	# of Accts	Total Value	Taxes Due
05-01-13/05-31-13	0	\$00.00	\$00.00
07-01-12/06-30-13	0	\$00.00	\$00.00

#### Motor Vehicle Release Report

Audit Dates	Accounts	Total Value
05-01-13/05-31-13	35	\$1,426.03

**Motor Vehicle Refund Report****Audit Dates**

05-01-13/05-31-13

**Number billed for**

May 2013

**Accounts**

11

4340

**Total Value**

\$455.83

**Garnishment Totals**

Month	Total Accounts	Original Levy Amt	Collected Amt
05-01-13/05-31-13	186	\$142,467.94	\$37,516.25
<b>F/Year 2012-13</b>			
(07-1-12/6-30-13)	1,432	\$486,700.33	\$317,758.42

**Interstate Collection Report**

May 2013

**Collection****Total Collected**

Cumulative Total Collected to Date

NC Debt Setoff

**\$148,836.49**

Cumulative Total Collected (to date)

Motor Vehicles

\$92,157.72

Cumulative Total Collected (to date)

Property Taxes

\$24,126.19

Cumulative Total Collected (to date)

EMS

\$154,677.90

Collected (to date)

All Categories

**\$270,961.81**

Tax Administrator Oakley noted the following:

- Have already went over the prior year taxes in the amount of \$126,206.57
- Currently at 96.7% of collecting what was billed excluding the discount amount

**Monthly Delinquent Tax Collection Report**

Tax Administrator Jake Oakley presented the following Monthly Delinquent Tax Collection Report for May 2013:

<u>County</u>	<u>Real/Personal</u>	<u>Property</u>	<u>May</u>	<u>2013</u>				
Year	Beginning Balance	Releases	Refunds	Debits/ Credits	Writeoffs	Payments	Ending Balance	
2011	\$ 252,339.13			\$127.61	\$ (0.52)	\$(13,839.30)	\$ 238,626.92	
2010	\$ 127,940.92			\$45.12		\$ (4,918.96)	\$ 123,067.08	
2009	\$ 80,635.58					\$ (1,527.92)	\$ 79,107.66	
2008	\$ 43,566.19			(\$213.21)		\$ (1,827.92)	\$ 41,525.06	
2007	\$ 26,136.36					\$ (486.55)	\$ 25,649.71	
2006	\$ 17,986.90						\$ 17,986.90	
2005	\$ 12,792.07					\$ (63.13)	\$ 12,728.94	
2004	\$ 13,071.28					\$ (9.60)	\$ 13,061.68	
2003	\$ 9,822.69					\$ (23.25)	\$ 9,799.44	
2002	\$ 8,051.22					\$ (5.93)	\$ 8,045.29	
2001	\$ 5,808.66						\$ 5,808.66	
2000	\$ 7,570.11						\$ 7,570.11	

June 10, 2013

8



1999	\$	7,962.76		\$	7,962.76
1998	\$	585.50	\$(225.83)	\$ Land	359.67

<u>County</u>	<u>Motor</u>	<u>Vehicles</u>	<u>May</u>	<u>2013</u>			
Year	Beginning Balance	Releases	Refunds	Debits/ Credits	Writeoffs	Payments	Ending Balance
2011	\$ 40,610.57				\$ (0.45)	\$ (3,083.47)	\$ 37,526.65
2010	\$ 32,121.57					\$ (300.97)	\$ 31,820.60
2009	\$ 23,573.02					\$ (91.41)	\$ 23,481.61
2008	\$ 21,532.71					\$ (148.51)	\$ 21,384.20
2007	\$ 18,549.25	\$ (6.30)				\$ (11.64)	\$ 18,531.31
2006	\$ 13,171.98	\$ (6.30)				\$ (39.91)	\$ 13,125.77
2005	\$ 15,898.25					\$ (110.84)	\$ 15,787.41
2004	\$ 14,255.42					\$ (107.26)	\$ 14,148.16
2003	\$ 14,267.43				\$ (0.44)	\$ (72.53)	\$ 14,194.46
2002	\$ 17,038.00						\$ 17,038.00
2001	\$ 14,532.16					\$ (18.72)	\$ 14,513.44
2000	\$ 18,592.98						\$ 18,592.98
1999	\$ 16,433.55					\$ (67.89)	\$ 16,365.66
1998	\$ 16,493.83				\$(16,490.69)	\$ (3.14)	\$ 00.00

<u>New</u>	<u>Schools</u>	<u>Forsyth</u>	<u>Tech</u>	<u>Fund</u>	<u>May</u>	<u>2013</u>	
Year	Beginning Balance	Releases	Refunds	Debits/ Credits	Writeoffs	Payments	Ending Balance
2011	\$ 18,038.17			\$8.51	\$ (0.06)	\$ (1,086.36)	\$ 16,960.26

Tax Administrator Oakley noted:

- As some of these older taxes get taken care of, there will be some land taxes remaining
- Will never request the Board to write off land

### Releases less than \$100 – Real and Personal Property

Tax Administrator Jake Oakley presented the following Releases less than \$100 – Real and Personal Property (May 2013) for the Board's review:

#### **Releases less than \$100 - Real/Personal**

<b>Property</b>	<b>May 2013</b>	
<b>Name</b>	<b>Bill Number</b>	<b>Amount</b>
Theraplay of NC PC	12A156030395.09.1	\$31.00
Thomas W Herman	12A156015363.09.1	<u>\$2.38</u>
	<b>Total Amount</b>	<b>\$33.38</b>

### **Present-Use Value Late Applications**

Tax Administrator Jake Oakley presented the following Present-Use Value Late Applications with a request for approval at the June 24<sup>th</sup> meeting:

Name	Parcel #	Acres	Reason
Arthur & Martha Parent	606000292544	41.51	Land has been owned & operated as a farm
	606000295037	2.07	for many years
Stephen & Bonne Sloan, Jr	693204600642	32.11	Forestland has been owned for about ten years

Tax Administrator Oakley noted:

- Request to place on the June 24<sup>th</sup> Consent Agenda

### **Write-Off Request (Real Property Billings)**

Tax Administrator Jake Oakley presented the following Real Property Billings Write-Off Request with a request for approval at the June 24<sup>th</sup> meeting:

Tax Year	Account	Parcel	Principal Amount Due
2006	49265	695204723402	\$45.85
2006	9894	695204721317	<u>\$430.00</u>
		Total	<b>\$475.85</b>

Tax Administrator Oakley noted the following:

- Tax Office has determined that there is no further recourse of collection on the two submitted Real Property Billings from the Tax Year 2006
- In 2010, a certification of taxes to a local attorney on descendant parcels of the above listed ancestor tracts, failed to include a principal amount of \$475.85 of taxes due
- Per NCGS 105-361(b), no further recourse of collection
- Request to place on the June 24<sup>th</sup> Consent Agenda

### **Write-Off Request (1999 EMS Bills)**

Tax Administrator Jake Oakley presented the following 1999 EMS Bills Write-Off Request:

Tax Year	Accounts	Principal Amount Due
1999	585	<b>\$91,464.37</b>

Tax Administrator Oakley noted the following:

- Tax Office has determined that there is no further recourse of collection on the 585 EMS accounts from the Tax Year 1999
- Request to be written off per NCGS 105-378
- Request to place on the June 24<sup>th</sup> Consent Agenda

**Write-Off Request (1999 & 2000 Real Property Bills) & (2002 Real Property Bills)**

Tax Administrator Jake Oakley presented the following 1999 & 2000 Personal Property Bills and 2002 Real Property Bills Write-Off Request:

<b>Tax Year</b>	<b>Accounts</b>	<b>Principal Amount Due</b>	
1999	93	\$7,117.82	Personal
2000	93	\$6,703.93	Personal
2002	2	<u>\$634.46</u>	Real
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$14,456.21</b>	

Tax Administrator Oakley noted the following:

- Tax Office has determined that there is no further recourse of collection
- Request to be written off per NCGS 105-378
- Request to place on the June 24<sup>th</sup> Consent Agenda

**Write-Off Request (1999 & 2000 Delinquent Vehicle Bills)**

Tax Administrator Jake Oakley presented the following 1999 & 2000 Delinquent Vehicle Bills:

<b>Tax Year</b>	<b>Accounts</b>	<b>Principal Amount Due</b>
1999	4.5	\$16,381.56
2000	766	<u>\$18,599.92</u>
	<b>Total</b>	<b>\$34,981.48</b>

Tax Administrator Oakley noted the following:

- Tax Office has determined that there is no further recourse of collection
- Request to be written off per NCGS 105-378
- Request to place on the June 24<sup>th</sup> Consent Agenda

Chairman Lankford opened the floor for discussion.

Chairman Lankford confirmed with Tax Administrator Oakley that everything is up to date thru 1999.

Chairman Lankford also confirmed with Tax Administrator Oakley that everything should be up to date to 2003 within the next few months.

Chairman Lankford noted his desire to be proactive trying to collect the funding especially before the statutory limits run out.

Tax Administrator Oakley noted statutes do not allow the Tax Collector to pursue collection if the bill is over ten years.

Commissioner Walker confirmed with Administrator Oakley that the collection procedures were the same, but previous tax administrators did not bring uncollectable old bills to the board to be written off.

Tax Administrator Oakley noted the department was trying to clean up the old motor vehicle bills since the state is getting ready to take over the collection.

Commissioner Walker questioned Tax Administrator Oakley regarding an estimate of the write offs remaining?

Tax Administrator Oakley responded:

- Personal property - \$5,000 to \$6,000
- Land –will never bring a parcel to the Board
- EMS – varies, depends on the number of calls (1999 was \$91,464)

Tax Administrator Oakley noted that the EMS insurance billing is current.

Tax Administrator Oakley noted that staff is working diligently to have all bills processed within 30 days of the service.

Tax Administrator Oakley commended his collection staff in getting the billing/insurance filing current and their continued effort to keep the process up to date.

Vice Chairman Booth noted the consolidation of EMS has improved in the efficiency of the

insurance billing.

Chairman Lankford, with full consensus of the Board, directed the Clerk to place the following on the June 24<sup>th</sup> Consent Agenda:

- Present-Use Value Late Applications
- Write Off Request – Real Property (2006)
- Write Off Request – 1999 EMS Bills
- Write Off Request – 1999 & 2000 Personal Property Bills
- Write Off Request – 2002 Real Property Bills
- Write Off Request – 1999 & 2000 Delinquent Vehicle Bills

**East Coast Pyrotechnics – Request for Fireworks Display – The Vineyard**

County Manager Rick Morris presented the following Request:

- Request approval to do a public display of fireworks on Friday, July 5<sup>th</sup> at approximately 9:00 pm at The Vineyard
- Licensed operator will be Mr. Tomas Diaz
- Fire Marshal Frankie Burcham has reviewed the application and recommend the application be approved by the Stokes County Board of Commissioners
- If approved by the BOCC, the Fire Marshal's office will complete the application process and inspect the site prior to the issuance of a permit as approved by the NC Fire Code
- Request to be on the June 24<sup>th</sup> Action Agenda

The Board had no issues with the request and agreed to place the item on the June 24<sup>th</sup> Consent Agenda.

Chairman Lankford, with full consensus of the Board, directed the Clerk to place the item the June 24<sup>th</sup> Consent Agenda.

**Proposed Law Enforcement Agreement – Town of Walnut Cove**

County Manager Rick Morris presented the Board with the following proposed Agreement from the Town of Walnut Cove:

**STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA**

**AGREEMENT**

**COUNTY OF STOKES**

THIS AGREEMENT is entered into this the 1<sup>st</sup> day of July, 2013, by and among THE TOWN OF WALNUT COVE, hereinafter referred to as "THE TOWN" and THE COUNTY OF STOKES, hereinafter referred to as "THE COUNTY," on behalf of the STOKES COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE, hereinafter referred to as "SCSO" as follows:

WITNESSETH:

WHEREAS THE TOWN has a desire and a need to provide law enforcement officers within its corporate boundaries in order to keep the peace, to enforce the criminal laws of the State of North Carolina, to enforce the ordinances established by THE COUNTY and THE TOWN and to maintain order in their TOWN; and

WHEREAS THE COUNTY is authorized to provide the services outlined herein pursuant to the provisions of N.C.G.S 160A-461, et.seq; and

WHEREAS THE COUNTY acting through the SCSO is willing and agreeable to hire, to employ, to train, to assign and to supervise law enforcement officers from the Sheriff's Office to be assigned to THE TOWN;

NOW THEREFORE, THE PARTIES HERETO AGREE as follows:

I. THE TOWN AGREES:

- A. For Fiscal Year 2013-2014, THE TOWN will pay the total amount of \$140,000 to THE COUNTY for providing law enforcement services in THE TOWN. This total amount will be paid by THE TOWN in four equal payments of \$35,000, with the payments due on September 30, 2013, December 30, 2013, March 30, 2014 and June 30, 2014.
- B. For each Fiscal Year following the first year of this agreement, the annual payment due from THE TOWN will increase by an amount equal to the latest available and published Consumer Price Index. The adjustment amount, if any, shall be determined by mutual agreement on or before April 1 of the preceding year. The annual payments will be paid by THE TOWN in four equal payments, with the payments due on September 30, December 30, March 30 and June 30 of each Fiscal Year.
- C. To provide office space within the town limits of Walnut Cove for use by the SCSO during the period of this agreement. The SCSO shall use this office space solely in connection with law enforcement services and activities being performed within the town limits of Walnut Cove.
- D. That on or before July 1, 2013, THE TOWN will turn over two Ford Crown Victoria patrol cars, currently owned by THE TOWN, to the SCSO. The Sheriff of Stokes County shall have the sole discretion in determining which two Ford Crown Victoria patrol cars will be turned over to the SCSO. The SCSO shall immediately assume ownership and all responsibility for those patrol cars, including but not limited to the

maintenance of all required insurance. THE COUNTY and the SCSO shall comply with any requests made by THE TOWN to facilitate the transfer of this property, including the transfer of the title for each vehicle.

- E. That on or before July 1, 2013, THE TOWN will turn over four handguns, four Tasers and four protective vests, which are currently owned by THE TOWN, to the SCSO. The SCSO will immediately assume ownership and all responsibility for this equipment. These handguns, Tasers and protective vests will be used by the SCSO in connection with law enforcement services and activities being performed for the Town of Walnut Cove. Other equipment may also be transferred if deemed appropriate, upon the agreement of the SCSO and THE TOWN.
- F. THE TOWN agrees to transfer any balance on hand of Federal Fines & Forfeitures funding to the SCSO upon execution of this agreement.

## II. THE COUNTY AGREES:

- A. To provide dedicated law enforcement services within the town limits of Walnut Cove. Specifically, THE COUNTY agrees to have at least one officer assigned and providing law enforcement services to the Town of Walnut Cove at all times, twenty-four hours per day, seven days per week. THE COUNTY, acting through the SCSO, will have at least one officer present within the town limits at all times, twenty-four hours per day, seven days per week, except in the case of an emergency requiring the officer to leave THE TOWN'S limits, whether or not such emergency is related to THE TOWN. Furthermore, the parties to this agreement recognize and agree that there may be temporary instances where the Sheriff of Stokes County, in his discretion, determines that the officer assigned to THE TOWN needs to be outside of the town limits, for law enforcement services related to THE TOWN, for example where the officer is needed to transport an arrestee to the magistrate and/or jail. During any such instances, other officers of the SCSO will be available to provide law enforcement services to THE TOWN, although those officers may not be located within the town limits. The SCSO agrees to use best efforts to keep such instances to a minimum and, furthermore, to minimize the time of any such instance. If it is determined, by the SCSO, that the assigned officer will be outside of the town limits for an extended period of time, then the SCSO will assign another officer to be present within the town limits. Furthermore, THE COUNTY, acting through the SCSO, will provide adequate law enforcement services to ensure safety and security for various special events in THE TOWN, including but not limited to THE TOWN'S annual Halloween Celebration, THE TOWN'S annual Christmas parade, HE TOWN'S annual July 3<sup>rd</sup> fireworks and concert event, and other events as requested by THE TOWN'S Mayor, Town Manager and/or Board of Commissioners..
- B. That the SCSO will provide all law enforcement services in THE TOWN, including but not limited to patrol work, investigative services and local ordinance

enforcement. This agreement does not, in any manner, limit the services which would otherwise be provided within the town limits of THE TOWN by the SCSO, if there were not an agreement. This agreement, and the payments made pursuant to this agreement, are solely for the purpose of contracting for services in addition to those already required of the SCSO.

- C. The SCSO will take the necessary steps and actions to ensure that at least one officer is educated, trained, and qualified to investigate traffic accidents. The SCSO will make officers who are so trained available to investigate traffic accidents which occur within the limits of THE TOWN. The SCSO may, in its discretion, contact the North Carolina State Highway Patrol and request the assistance of the North Carolina State Highway Patrol in investigating and otherwise handling any traffic accident, as the SCSO deems necessary and appropriate.
- D. To provide the necessary Police Professional Liability Insurance to protect Stokes County and the Stokes County Sheriff's Office

### III. THE PARTIES AGREE:

That the law enforcement officers assigned to THE TOWN pursuant to this Agreement remain employees of the Stokes County Sheriff's Office at all times during the term of this Agreement. Under the general concept of community-based policing, these officers will be responsible for performing law enforcement duties within THE TOWN to include, but not be limited to: patrolling within THE TOWN; answering calls for service within THE TOWN; conducting general security checks within THE TOWN and otherwise interacting with residents and visitors within THE TOWN. The TOWN agrees to obtain prior written approval from the Sheriff or his designee before assigning an officer provided under this Agreement to perform other or additional duties.

Notwithstanding the above, the parties understand and agree that the Stokes County Sheriff's primary responsibility at all times is law enforcement and safety within all of Stokes County and that circumstances may arise wherein the Sheriff determines it is necessary to reassign one or more officers from THE TOWN for a given period of time in order to meet that primary responsibility. In the event that any officer is reassigned from THE TOWN for a given period of time, the SCSO will assign another officer to THE TOWN for that given period of time, in order to fulfill the obligations set forth above in paragraph II(A).

### IV. METHOD OF PAYMENT

- A. The annual payments will be paid by THE TOWN in four equal payments, with the payments due on September 30, December 30, March 30 and June 30 of each fiscal year. Payment may be made by either hand delivering or mailing the payment to THE COUNTY.



- B. THE TOWN shall be considered in default on the payments if any payment is more than thirty (30) days past due and THE COUNTY has made a written request to THE TOWN for payment. In the event that THE TOWN is in default on any payment, the SCSO will immediately be relieved of the obligations of this agreement set forth above in paragraph II(A). However, all other law enforcement services required of the SCSO to THE TOWN and/or within the town limits of THE TOWN shall continue, as set forth above in paragraph II(B).

V. TERM OF AGREEMENT

- A. This agreement shall be effective for three years, specifically Fiscal Years 2013-2014, 2014-2015 and 2015-2016.
- B. The Agreement may be extended for additional and successive terms upon agreement of the parties and the execution of the appropriate amendment to the agreement.

VI. AMENDMENT TO THE AGREEMENT

The Agreement may be amended or modified only by agreement of both parties in writing.

VII. TERMINATION OF THE AGREEMENT

The Agreement may be terminated by any party upon giving Notice of Termination in writing to the other parties to the Agreement. Notice shall be in writing and provided as follows: to the Town Manager of Walnut Cove at P.O. Box 130, Walnut Cove, North Carolina 27052; to the County Manager, c/o The County Of Stokes, P.O. Box 20, Danbury, North Carolina 27016. The Notice must be given by the party desiring to terminate this agreement six months prior to the termination date. In the event of termination of this agreement by either party, any payments due from THE TOWN to THE COUNTY shall be prorated and due immediately upon the effective termination date. Furthermore, in the event of termination of this agreement by either party, any remaining property transferred from THE TOWN to THE COUNTY and/or the SCSO during the term of the agreement will be immediately returned to THE TOWN. If necessary, the parties to this agreement agree to then take all necessary steps to transfer title to any of the remaining original equipment to THE TOWN

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the hereto parties have executed this Agreement the date and year first written above.

COUNTY OF STOKES

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
County Manager

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

STOKES COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Sheriff

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

TOWN OF WALNUT COVE

By: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

County Manager Morris noted:

- Walnut Cove Board of Commissioners voted on June 4<sup>th</sup> to deliver a law enforcement contract to the county manager for review and/or action by the Board of County Commissioners
- Sheriff Mike Marshall and I have both made comments on the initial draft agreement before it was placed on the Town's Agenda
- Told the manager that comments were informal and if approved by the Town Board would have to be presented to the Board of Commissioners for review, changes if needed and approval
- The proposed agreement is basically for a level of support for law enforcement for the Town of Walnut Cove, similar to the agreement with the Stokes County School System for School Resource Officers
- Sheriff will deliver \$140,000 worth of law enforcement support to the Town of Walnut Cove if approved
- The proposed agreement is not meant to match the exact services being performed currently
- Walnut Cove Town Manager Bryon Ellis and Sheriff Mike Marshall are in attendance at today's meeting to answer any questions
- Manager Ellis has requested the item be moved to today's Action Agenda due to the projected startup date of July 1<sup>st</sup> and notification to employees being impacted

Chairman Lankford opened the floor for discussion.

Vice Chairman Booth commented:

- Have read in a newspaper story that the Town expects to receive the same service currently provided by the Walnut Cove Police Department
- Would like to know the amount of officers that will be needed to meet the contract stipulations of law enforcement 24/7

Sheriff Mike Marshall responded:

- Sheriff's Office will have four (4) officers, one officer per shift, provided to the town

Vice Chairman Booth questioned if it would not take more than four (4) officers to cover for

regular officers being off for comp. time, vacation, sick leave etc.?

Sheriff Mike Marshall responded:

- \$140,000 was offered
- What is in the proposed agreement is what the Sheriff's Office can provide for the \$140,000

Vice Chairman Booth confirmed with Sheriff Marshall that his department could provide the manpower, equipment, vehicles and have 24/7 coverage.

Sheriff Marshall stated that anything beyond what is in the proposed agreement will cost more money; what is in the proposed agreement is what the Town will get for the \$140,000.

Vice Chairman Booth questioned Sheriff Marshall if there were any concerns with salaries, replacing equipment/vehicles with the \$140,000 agreement to give the Town the 24/7 patrol?

Sheriff Marshall responded:

- If the Town elects to shut down the police department and offer no support, it is then responsibility of Sheriff's Office with no money
- Did not come into this and price this agreement
- Came into this, as far as a discussion, regarding the elimination of the police department and the impact it would have on the Sheriff's Office
- Was very direct with the Town Manager
- Initial discussion was \$100,000
- Told the Town Manager that \$100,000 would not get 24/7 service
- Town Manager stated the Town would only offer \$140,000 and no more
- Worked with Chief Deputy Carico to determine what could be provided for \$140,000
- What is stated in the proposed agreement is exactly what can be provided to the Town for the \$140,000
- As far as vehicles, the Town is providing the initial vehicles
- My point of view where I stand right now is if the Town shuts down the police department with no support to the county, it will definitely have a big impact on my department

Vice Chairman Booth questioned what would be the impact in that area if the police department were to be shut down?

Sheriff Mike Marshall responded:

- Several businesses in the town need extra services that the Sheriff's Office does not currently have the manpower to carry out
- Can't provide the security checks needed

Vice Chairman Booth questioned if it was the department's obligation to provide those extra services if a town does not have a police department?

Sheriff Mike Marshall responded:

- If the Town shuts down the police department, it is my department's responsibility to provide security to all citizens of Stokes County
- Town is stating that they are going to shut down the police department
- The Town is asking for extra services and would be willing to pay for those services just as the school system does for school resource officers
- It is clear that the Town will receive what they pay for
- Have not tried to paint a glorious picture of what it will or will not be
- Will provide the extra services that the Town pays for
- For example, if the County was to cut the department's budget, would only be able to provide what services could be afforded
- With what is outlined in the proposed agreement, the department can make it work
- Of course, the more money you have, the more you can provide
- Understand the Town's situation is a financial situation
- In the proposed agreement, it states upon termination, any remaining property transferred from the Town to the County and/or Stokes County Sheriff's Office during the term of the agreement will be immediately returned to the Town
- Feels this statement might indicate in the future, the Town may decide to reopen the police department

Vice Chairman Booth continued:

- Read some of the Town Commissioners' comments that services would be exactly the same with less cost, their cost is approximately \$360,000
- Can't see going down to \$140,000 and delivering the same service

Sheriff Mike Marshall responded:

- Can give the Town the same services the rest of the county receives, but if the Town desires additional officers, it can be provided to the Town with the proposed agreement
- As far as investigations, the department already has an Investigation Division that currently works with the Walnut Cove Police Department, no extra cost to the County
- As far as parades, events, etc., the department already provides officers for those events
- Can eliminate some services provided by the police department with county services already in place
- Not trying to take over the police department, do not want to see the department shut down; however, the Town is stating that they can't financially afford the police department
- My understanding is that the Town is going to shut the police department down and it will definitely have an impact to my department

Commissioner Walker commented:

- Confirmed with Sheriff Marshall that Manager Morris, Manager Ellis and himself had reviewed and edited the proposed agreement before the Town approved the agreement
- Newspaper stated that the proposed agreement stated that the County agrees to have at least once officer assigned and providing law enforcement services to the Town of Walnut Cove at all times, 24 hours per day, 7 days a week
- Proposed agreement also states there will be an officer assigned to the Town, except in the case of an emergency requiring the officer to leave the town's limits, whether or not such emergency is related to the town

Sheriff Marshall responded:

- Proposed agreement states in that same paragraph that there may be temporary instances where the Sheriff of Stokes County, in his discretion, determines that the officer assigned to the Town needs to be outside of the town limits, for law enforcement services related to the Town, for example, the officer is needed to transport an arrestee to the magistrate and/or jail
- This same situation happens currently within the five quadrants of the County
- If an officer in one quadrant has to leave their area, officers in close by quadrants move closer to the line

Commissioner Walker confirmed with Sheriff Marshall that he has this type of plan in action that allows for this type of situation for the county and could apply that same plan with the Town.

Commissioner Walker stated that he yields to the Sheriff's knowledge and experience in law enforcement for many years.

Commissioner Walker questioned Sheriff Marshall if he is comfortable that this is a fair and workable arrangement for the County and the Town of Walnut Cove in its current form?

Sheriff Marshall responded:

- Comfortable with what is in the contract based off of funding being provided by the Town, comfortable with that aspect of it
- Feels like what the manager stated, it will be a lot like what is provided to the school system with the school resource officers
- Went into this with the attitude of trying to convince the town manager and the mayor to take a different direction, bottom line, there is a financial situation to my understanding
- Willing to work with the Town, but with the hopes the police department can be put back in place in the future

Commissioner Walker continued:

- Appreciate the willingness of the Sheriff to work with the Town
- Strong proponent of working together
- On board with working with the towns and cities within the County

Commissioner Jones commented:

- Read the proposed agreement
- Understand the financial situation
- Totally understand in this economy why the Town needs the Sheriff's assistance
- Must also keep in mind the impact if the police department disbands and there is no compensation from the Town
- Glad the Town will transfer the equipment and hope they can reopen in the future
- One question, what happens to the debt taken by the Town for the new VIPER radios purchased by the County?

County Manager Morris noted that issue had not been discussed.

Commissioner Inman commented:

- Questioned had the Town made a decision in open session to disband the police department?

Town Manager Bryon Ellis responded:

- Formally no, can't speak for the Board

Commissioner Inman continued:

- Questioned if the Consumer Price Index increase built into the proposed agreement takes care of increase to maintain \$140,000 level of service?

Sheriff Marshall responded:

- In my opinion, should maintain it
- Proposed agreement also states the Town will relinquish the ABC monies to the Sheriff's Office

Town Manager Ellis noted the ABC monies were approximately \$3500 last year.

Commissioner Inman continued:

- Seems to be a good transitional phase so that if things dramatically improve for the Town, it could reinstate its police department
- Questioned with this budget and the \$140,000, can the Sheriff's Office deliver what you say you can deliver?

Sheriff Mike Marshall responded:

- Can deliver what is in the proposed agreement
- Only concern now is, can everything needed be done in time to deliver services on July 1<sup>st</sup>
- Town's next meeting is scheduled for June 27<sup>th</sup>

- Don't believe a couple of days will be enough time for everything to be transferred over

Commissioner Inman commented:

- Good with the proposed agreement

Chairman Lankford questioned Town Manager Ellis if there were monies in the Town's budget for the VIPER radios?

Town Manager Ellis responded:

- Have only talked briefly about the radios during the discussions
- There was no decision made
- Walnut Cove Fire Department willing to take some of the radios
- Will need four radios for officers
- This is something that will need to be negotiated
- Town did agree to purchase the radios, but will not need them

Chairman Lankford continued:

- That question definitely needs to be answered before the next meeting, June 24<sup>th</sup>

Commissioner Inman questioned what was the cost of the radios and did the Sheriff incorporate any of the radio cost in the \$140,000 budget proposal?

Town Manager Ellis responded:

- Approximately \$43,000 (two payments of \$21,500)

Sheriff Marshall responded:

- Was not incorporated into the \$140,000 budget

County Manager Morris suggested working this issue separate and determine where the radios need to go.

Chairman Lankford directed the Clerk to place the item the June 24<sup>th</sup> Action Agenda.

Commissioner Walker noted the Town Manager's request to move the item to today's Action Agenda and the Sheriff's comments regarding the amount of time needed for the transition.

Commissioner Walker suggested placing the proposed agreement on today's Action Agenda contingent on the radio issue being worked out satisfactorily.

Chairman Lankford stated he personally felt the decision could not be made until the 24<sup>th</sup>.

Commissioner Walker moved to place the item on today's Action Agenda.

Commissioner Jones seconded the motion.

Commissioner Jones stated that she agreed due to the radios and the proposed agreement being two separate issues and the time crunch trying to get this done by July 1<sup>st</sup>; don't want to work against the Sheriff's Office.

County Manager Morris noted that the proposed agreement also needs legal review.

Commissioner Inman questioned if the decision is held until the next agenda, what impact would it have on Town and how long would it take for the Sheriff's Office to take over?

Town Manager Ellis responded:

- Would not disband the police department until everything is ready

Sheriff Marshall responded:

- Should take approximately one to two weeks

Commissioner Walker commented:

- Seems like a very clear line to work toward with the end of one fiscal year and the beginning of a new fiscal year; impact on both County and Town 2013-14 budgets
- Think it would be helpful to both Boards to get this settled
- Don't see waiting two weeks to clear up one aspect

Chairman Lankford noted that the Town has not formally disbanded the police department and will not meet again until June 27<sup>th</sup>.

Town Manager Ellis noted the Town could call a special meeting if necessary.

Commissioner Inman reiterated that Town Manager Ellis had stated there will be no loss of police coverage at any time.

Chairman Lankford called the question.

The motion failed 2-3 with Chairman Lankford, Vice Chairman Booth, and Commissioner Inman voting against the motion.



## **NCDOT- Request for Abandonment – A portion of SR#1427 – Jefferson Road**

County Manager Rick Morris provided the following information regarding the request from NCDOT to Abandon a portion of SR#1427 – Jefferson Road:

- Request is to abandon a portion of SR#1427 – Jefferson Road from the Secondary Road System
- County's current practice is to also abandon the right of way of the requested portion of the road
- Planning Director David Sudderth and Tax Administrator Jake Oakley both noted the loss of an existing easement for one specific property owner, James Dale Beasley
- Staff contacted Mr. Beasley (lives out of state) who was unaware that the item was being place on the Board's Agenda due to the fact that his easement had not recorded by the Fortino family
- Mr. Beasley originally requested the item be held until further notice
- Mr. Beasley contacted Ms. Fortino who came to the county office on Friday and recorded the needed easement
- Mr. Beasley contacted county staff on Friday and stated he now had no issue with going forward with the abandonment
- Ms. Fortino stated that a lot of young teenagers go to the end of the road and do things that they shouldn't be doing, garbage being dumped, etc.
- Mr. Beasley expressed his appreciation to county staff for informing him of the situation
- Request direction from the Board to continue abandonment of the portion of Jefferson Road
- Provided board members with a copy of the recorded easement

Chairman Lankford opened the floor for discussion.

Commissioner Inman commented:

- No issues since the easement has been settled and recorded

Vice Chairman Booth commented:

- Confirmed with staff that all issues pertaining to the easement had been resolved

Clerk Bullins responded:

- Reiterated Manager Morris' comments that Mr. Beasley stated that his understanding was he would have a recorded easement in hand before anything was done regarding the abandonment
- Ms. Fortino stated that an official from NCDOT (she thinks) told her she could just wait until the abandonment was approved to record the easement
- Ms. Fortino was very apologetic and didn't mean to mislead Mr. Beasley in any way
- Ms. Fortino did not fully understand what the full process of abandonment meant and understood Mr. Beasley' concerns regarding the easement

Commissioner Walker commented:

- Questioned if there had been any comments of opposition

Clerk Bullins responded:

- Not so far
- There would be a public hearing (as required by statute) during the process for anyone to speak in opposition

Commissioner Jones commented:

- All parties are happy and issues have been resolved
- Have no problem with proceedings

Chairman Lankford, with full consensus of the Board, directed the Clerk to place the item on the June 24<sup>th</sup> Action Agenda.

**Proposed Letter of Commitment – EDA Grant Application**

County Manager Rick Morris presented the following proposed letter of commitment for the EDA Grant Application:

June 10, 2013

Dear H. Philip Paradice, Jr.

Director, Atlanta Regional Office

US Dept. of Commerce, Economic Development Administration

401 West Peachtree St., N.W., Suite 1820

Atlanta, Georgia 30308-3510

Re: EDA Control No. 0664; 2<sup>nd</sup> Response; Stokes County – Meadows and Forsyth Tech Water & Sewer Improvements EDA Grant Application dated 3-13-13.

Dear Mr. Paradice,

This letter represents a response to your first comment in your letter to Stokes County dated May 2, 2013, regarding EDA needing documentation confirming non-EDA matching or cost share funding, such as letters of commitment and other documentation.

Stokes County is requesting \$3 million from EDA through the grant referenced above. As required by EDA, Stokes County must show a dollar-for-dollar match for the full requested amount.

Stokes County Commissioners have discussed this item on June 10, 2013 and commit to provide the full match as required. The match is composed of the \$2 million Stokes County has already secured from the Golden LEAF Foundation, plus \$1 million from other grant applications that have been submitted which we expect to receive (total \$1.4 million in requested funding), as well as other county funding, if necessary, to meet the matching requirements.

June 10, 2013

Sincerely,

Chairman Ernest Lankford  
Stokes Board of County Commissioners

cc: Robin Cooley, EDA NC Regional Representative  
Richard D. Morris, County Manager  
Charles Anderson, Pilot View

Manager Morris noted the following:

- Proposed letter of commitment is regarding the EDA Grant
- Would fund primarily the water portion of the Water/Sewer Project to the Meadows area
- The EDA Grant requires a dollar for dollar match
- Golden LEAF's commitment of \$2 million can be used to match the EDA Grant as long as the timing is done correctly
- Above the \$2 million could potentially be match with other grants, could be match by general fund, or not match at all
- Letter of Commitment is required by EDA Grant
- County is not being put at any risk, county can take the portion that can be matched
- Action needs to be done today
- This requirement was found out last Friday during a conference call regarding the EDA Grant

Chairman Lankford opened the floor for discussion.

Vice Chairman Booth commented:

- Reiterated that anything above the \$2 million mark could be matched by other grants, not matched and refused
- Information received in Washington last week noted that normally no one gets over the \$2 million amount
- County has made application for \$3 million
- There is only \$150 million for the entire United States
- With all the disasters, competition will be very hard

Commissioner Walker commented:

- Confirmed with Manager Morris that the Board would have the option to decide if county funds would be used to match any portion of the EDA
- My understanding is that this Board has taken the position along to not use county dollars for this particular part of the project
- My understanding was the main project was the sewer with the water not holding up that project

Manager Morris commented:

- The timing issue could come into play, if the Golden LEAF funding was spent for sewer before the EDA Grant was awarded, it could no longer be used as a match
- Expressed these concerns during the visit in Washington regarding the need of leftover funding in this fiscal year
- Commissioner Walker's understanding is correct that the sewer is the main project with the water not holding up that part of the project

Commissioner Walker confirmed with Manager Morris that this type of letter is a standard requirement and does not lock the county into anything; on board with the letter.

Commissioner Jones commented:

- Appreciate the strategy trying to get the timing right with the other grants
- Need this funding
- Glad the county has the option to determine the match if it is over \$2 million
- On board with the letter

Commissioner Inman commented:

- Just want to clarify a few things
- Goal all along has been to get grants for the entire project
- Fallback position is to do sewer only, but not in the fallback position yet
- In position to try to get grants for the entire Water and Sewer Project to create an economic development opportunity in the Meadows area that is desperately needed
- Hearing from Manager Morris and Vice Chairman Booth that \$2 million is probably all the county could expect if approved
- County has the Golden LEAF \$2 million which could hopefully be used for the match without any county dollars
- With what is on the table (grants awarded and applied for), there would be no county funding in the project
- On board with the letter of commitment

Vice Chairman Booth reiterated it is a timing matter right now trying to get the EDA funding awarded in time to use the Golden LEAF funding as a match.

County Manager Morris noted that if there was no grant funding for water, there would have to be some work done with the water pertaining to water suppression for the new building which can't be done with the current water system.

Chairman Lankford noted that it was consensus of the Board to have the Chairman execute the proposed letter of commitment.

### **Appointments – Walnut Cove Planning Board – ETJ**

County Manager Rick Morris noted the vacancies:

- One regular and one alternate appointments
- Walnut Cove Planning Board recommends the following:
  - Arzell Montgomery – regular appointee
  - Kevin Webb – alternate appointee

Chairman Lankford opened the floor for nominations.

Commissioner Inman nominated:

- Arzell Montgomery – regular appointment
- Kevin Webb – alternate appointment

Chairman Lankford entertained a motion to close the nominations.

Commissioner Inman moved to close the nominations. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Lankford, with full consensus of the Board, directed the Clerk to place the item on the June 24<sup>th</sup> Action Agenda.

### **Appointments – Stokes County Board of Social Services**

County Manager Rick Morris noted the vacancy:

- Linda Hicks is no longer eligible to serve as an appointee on the DSS Board
- Pam Hooker, who lives in the Westfield community, has expressed an interest in the appointment

Chairman Lankford opened the floor for nominations.

Vice Chairman Booth nominated:

- Pam Hooker

Chairman Lankford entertained a motion to close the nominations.

Vice Chairman Booth moved to close the nominations. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Lankford, with full consensus of the Board, directed the Clerk to place the item on the June 24<sup>th</sup> Action Agenda.

### **Appointments – Stokes County Planning Board**

County Manager Rick Morris noted the terms that will expire June 30, 2014:

- Lewis Wood – Danbury Township
- Patrick Flinchum – Meadows Township
- Ronnie Tilley – Big Creek Township
- Tommy White – Peters Creek Township

Chairman Lankford opened the floor for nominations.

Commissioner Inman nominated:

- Lewis Wood – Danbury Township
- Patrick Flinchum – Meadows Township
- Ronnie Tilley – Big Creek Township
- Tommy White – Peters Creek Township

Chairman Lankford entertained a motion to close the nominations.

Vice Chairman Booth moved to close the nominations. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Lankford, with full consensus of the Board, directed the Clerk to place the item on the June 24<sup>th</sup> Action Agenda.

### **GENERAL GOVERNMENT – GOVERNING BODY – ACTION AGENDA**

#### **Leasing of Tower Space for Paging Equipment**

County Manager Rick noted the following:

- County was waiting for another proposal from Crown Communications
- Their bid is much higher - \$1800 per month
- Request immediate action for the proposal from Harold Day - \$450 per month

Chairman Lankford entertained a motion.

Vice Chairman Booth moved to approve the License Agreement with Harold E Day for tower space at \$1350 per quarter. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

#### **Proposed Bid - Senior Services Meal Programs**

Chairman Lankford entertained a motion.

Commissioner Inman moved to approve the bid from Golden Corral for Senior Meals at a rate of \$3.78 per meal for Fiscal Year 2013-14. Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

### **Proposed Bids – Transportation Services**

County Manager Morris noted that YVEDDI had been approached regarding the fuel surcharge to be the same as JD Cruises (\$0.10) above the \$2.46 per gallon average cost.

Manager Morris read the following answer from Transportation Director Jeff Cockerham:

Yes, we are willing to and have plans to assess the transportation billing rate. However, YVEDDI Public Transportation has implemented in both Yadkin and Davie County a new software program which has its' own billing component. We will be incorporating Stokes County into the scheduling in June provided that all processes continue to advance at the pace we are currently on. Since this is going to be new for us, we are hesitant to change anything about our billing at this time. When we compare the billing produced with the new software, to the billing of the old software, we want to make sure that we are comparing apples to apples. Changing the fuel surcharge rate or any part of the billing rate before the transition is complete would complicate that effort.

We are committed to providing the best possible services at a rate that is fair to both the County of Stokes, its' citizens and to our agency. We respectfully ask that we be given at least 90 days from full implementation in Stokes to assess whether we are billing at the correct rate. We will be glad to address the rate then. We have already communicated to the Stokes DSS that we were continuing the billing rate from FY 13 without change. This decision was made knowing that we would be reevaluating our billing process and rate after the Stokes scheduling was incorporated into the new software.

County Manager Morris noted this does not really answer the question.

Chairman Lankford opened the floor for further discussion.

Chairman Lankford reiterated the need for the fuel surcharge to be the same.

Vice Chairman Booth noted YVEDDI gets fuel from the County.

Commissioner Inman questioned what is YVEDDI's current cost for fuel for the County?

Manager Morris responded that the cost varies with every load of fuel, the cost is above \$2.

Commissioner Inman noted the need to know what the cost of the fuel is in order to analyze the issue.

Commissioner Walker stated that he could not support an ad hoc change without giving

YVEDDI a chance to explain.

Commissioner Walker commented:

- YVEDDI lost \$100,000+ last year in transportation
- Trying to regroup and get back on solid ground
- Agree with Manager Morris that Director Cockerham's answer was not quite complete, but did request an extension of time to put the new system in place and get a feel for the costs
- Did say they would then be glad to look at the cost
- Seems fair to let YVEDDI have a chance

Chairman Lankford commented:

- Agree it is fair, but still believe the motion needs to include a time frame for YVEDDI to respond to the request to match JD Cruises Transportation's fuel surcharge

Commissioner Walker commented

- Can agree to give YVEDDI 90 days to get the new system installed
- Comparing YVEDDI against JD Cruise is not a fair comparison, each provider operates different type vehicles, different cost structures, not an apple to apple comparison

County Manager Morris agreed you must know the price of county fuel in order to accurately compare.

Commissioner Inman stated that there does not need to be any down time with vital transportation needed for citizens in the county.

Commissioner Walker noted that his understanding was that YVEDDI rate would be relooked at in 90 days and then see where we need to go.

Commissioner Walker requested additional information before making any motions.

The Board unanimously agreed to request Director Cockerham at the next meeting and actual data regarding what each has been paid last year regarding the fuel surcharge.

Chairman Lankford, with full consensus, directed the staff to arrange for Director Cockerham to be at the next meeting and to have actual fuel consumption data available and place the item on the June 24<sup>th</sup> Action Agenda.



### **Records Retention & Disposition Schedules**

Chairman Lankford entertained a motion regarding the approval of Records & Disposition Schedules presented at the May 28<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Vice Chairman Booth moved to approve the following Records & Disposition Schedules:

- Sheriff's Department and amendment
- Tax Administration
- Veteran's Services

Commissioner Jones seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

### **DSS/Health Departments – House Bill #438**

Chairman Lankford entertained a motion regarding House Bill #438.

Commissioner Jones moved to approve with discussion. Vice Chairman Booth seconded the motion.

Commissioner Jones commented:

- Not one that thinks new is always better, but it is rare that the County gets an opportunity to try something new and still be able to have the option to revert back if it doesn't work
- As I have stated before, will not support, unless it can be reevaluated for the first year or two to make sure it is working, because it is not fair to anyone, want to do what is right
- Wanted to see both sides have a positive attitude and collaborate with each other because this is not about undermining each other
- Know there has been a lot of discussion that people are undermining and that one person is going to be the "gatekeeper" and that is just not so
- Only way to be sure about that is to be diplomatic and discussion
- I know there has been concern that Rick will be the "gatekeeper"
- We are behind him and we are on the line too because we signed up to do some training and whatever is required, I am concerned myself because I want to do a good job
- I want to do what is best for the entire county
- Sometimes things are much better when you try something new
- Want to give it a try
- Owe it to ourselves, it could be better
- Hear all the time, "if it ain't broke, don't fix it" but we could have room for improvement
- We can see if this will work instead of going ahead and just assume it will not work

- For me it is certainly not a power play, just to be more efficient and see if we can do better for our county

Vice Chairman Booth questioned a clarification of the motion.

County Manager Morris requested to speak before any further discussion.

Manager Morris noted that a resolution would need to be approved by the Board regarding this situation.

Manager Morris presented the following proposed Resolution prepared by County Attorney Powell:

### **RESOLUTION OF THE STOKES COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**

**WHEREAS**, a major goal of the North Carolina Association of County Commissioners has been to obtain legislation that would give all counties in North Carolina the flexibility to organize human services in such a way as to promote efficiency and effectiveness in their administration by removing the population threshold of 425,000 which rendered only three counties in the State eligible; and

**WHEREAS**, the North Carolina General Assembly passed House Bill 438 and the Governor of North Carolina on June 29, 2012 approved and signed the said bill, which is now Session Law 2012-126; and

**WHEREAS**, Session Law 2012-126 amends North Carolina General Statute 153A-77, which now provides that all Boards of County Commissioners in North Carolina may assume direct control of any activities theretofore conducted by or through the Board of Health and the Social Services Board and assume all powers, duties and responsibilities of the Board of Health and the Social Services Board; and

**WHEREAS**, the powers, duties and responsibilities of the Board of Health and the Social Services Board are set out in North Carolina General Statutes 130A-39 and 108A-9; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board of Commissioners may exercise the powers, duties, responsibilities and authority contained in North Carolina General Statute 153A-77 after a public hearing held by the Board pursuant to 30 days' notice of said public hearing given in a newspaper having general circulation in said county, which notice was duly given and which public hearing was duly held by the Board of Commissioners at the Board's regular meeting on October 8, 2012.

**WHEREAS**, North Carolina General Statute 153A-77 also provides that a Board of County Commissioners that has assumed direct control of a local health board and a local social services board and that does not delegate the powers and duties of those boards to a consolidated human services board shall appoint a human services advisory committee consistent with the membership requirements described in North Carolina General Statute 130A-35; and

**WHEREAS**, the membership requirements of North Carolina General Statute 130A-35 are that the human services advisory committee shall be composed of 11 members. The composition of the committee shall reasonably reflect the population makeup of the county and shall include: one physician licensed to practice medicine in this State, one licensed dentist, one licensed optometrist, one licensed veterinarian, one registered nurse, one licensed pharmacist, one county commissioner,

one professional engineer, and three representatives of the general public. Except as otherwise provided in this section, all members shall be residents of the county. If there is not a licensed physician, a licensed dentist, a licensed veterinarian, a registered nurse, a licensed pharmacist, or a professional engineer available for appointment, an additional representative of the general public shall be appointed. If however, one of the designated professions has only one person residing in the county, the Board of Commissioners shall have the option of appointing that person or a member of the general public. In the event a licensed optometrist who is a resident of the county is not available for appointment, then the Board of Commissioners shall have the option of appointing either a licensed optometrist who is a resident of another county or a member of the general public; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board of Commissioners of Stokes County now desires to assume direct control of all activities heretofore conducted by or through the Stokes County Board of Health and the Stokes County Social Services Board and to assume all powers, duties, responsibilities, and authority of the Stokes County Board of Health and the Stokes County Social Services Board.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY THE STOKES COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS AS FOLLOWS:**

1. That pursuant to North Carolina General Statute 153A-77, the Stokes County Board of Commissioners hereby assumes direct control of all activities heretofore conducted by the Stokes County Board of Health and the Stokes County Social Services Board, hereby conferring upon the Stokes County Board of Commissioners all powers, duties, responsibilities and authorities of the Stokes County Board of Health and the Stokes County Social Services Board as are set out in North Carolina General Statutes 130A-39 and 108A-9, and the said Stokes County Board of Health and Stokes County Social Services Board are abolished as provided by law; and
2. That the Stokes County Board of Commissioners hereby assumes the duty of hiring and firing the Directors of the Stokes County Health Department and the Stokes County Department of Social Services, and the County Manager shall supervise both Directors; and
3. That the Directors of the Stokes County Health Department and the Stokes County Department of Social Services shall retain their authorities defined in North Carolina General Statutes 130A-41 and 108A-14; and
4. That the Employees of the Stokes County Health Department and the Stokes County Department of Social Services will continue to be subject to the North Carolina State Personnel Act as established by Chapter 126 of the North Carolina General Statutes; and
5. That the Stokes County Board of Commissioners hereby creates the 11 member Human Services Advisory Committee in accordance with the requirements of North Carolina General Statute 153A-77(a) and North Carolina General Statute 130A-35, and agrees to appoint members consistent with the said membership requirements. Three members of the said Human Services Advisory Committee shall be filled by individuals who have an interest or background in Social Services related areas; and
6. That the Clerk to the Board of Commissioners shall advertise in the local newspaper to advise the citizens of Stokes County to make application for such committee; and
7. That the Human Services Advisory Committee will meet quarterly, or as needed, to consider Health and Social Services related issues and will report to the Stokes County Board of Commissioners bi-annually, or as needed; and
8. That the Stokes County Board of Commissioners will complete any Health Department or Social Services training required by statute or as necessary for departmental accreditation; and

9. That the Stokes County Board of Commissioners retains all budgetary authority over the Stokes County Health Department and the Stokes County Department of Social Services.

Adopted at its regular meeting, this \_\_\_\_\_ day of June, 2013.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Ernest Lankford, Chairman**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**James D. Booth, Vice Chairman**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**J. Leon Inman, Commissioner**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Ronda Jones, Commissioner**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Jimmy Walker, Commissioner**

**Attest:**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Darlene M. Bullins**  
**Clerk to the Board of Commissioners**

County Manager Morris commented:

- Staff sent the proposed Organizational Structure to Attorney Amiee Wall at the Institute of Government who has expertise in this matter to see if there were any issues
- Attorney Wall indicated that the Board of Commissioners did not have the authority to delegate the responsibility of hiring and firing the Directors of each agency due to the statutes only gives this authority to the Health and DSS Board which the Board of Commissioners are assuming direct control of (item#2 of the organization structure)
- The proposed resolution incorporates the eight items of the organizational structure with the correction to item #2 (hiring and firing of the director)
- To assume control of Health and DSS, the Board of Commissioners would need to approve the proposed resolution per Attorney Powell

Commissioner Jones withdrew her motion. Vice Chairman Booth withdrew his second to the motion.

Commissioner Jones moved to approve the resolution to change the organizational structure of the Health and Social Services Departments. Vice Chairman Booth seconded the motion.

Commissioner Inman commented:

- All the employees of both departments will remain under the State Personnel Act
- A lot of counties that have made some type of change have not allowed the employees to remain under the State Personnel Act
- To me, it really affords a lot of protection to those employees, even if the person is fired, the employee can appeal through the due process afforded to them under the North Carolina Personnel Act

- Only employees of DSS and Health have that right to due process, no other county employee is afforded that same due process
- Advisory Board will be, by statute, fit the prescription in House Bill #438
- Have had great citizens serve on both boards
- Would like to recognize Linda Hicks, who is in attendance, for her six years of service on the DSS Board and has done a great job
- Still going to have, if approved, an advisory board
- County has two advisory boards that work really well – Economic Development Commission and the Animal Control Advisory Board
- Animal Control Advisory Board has done an outstanding job and this Board listens to their suggestions
- Economic Development Commission is also an advisory board that this Board listens to
- There are no issues with our directors, county is very fortunate to have two great directors – DSS Director Kristy Preston who has done a great job and Health Director Scott Lenhart who led the Health Department to its first accreditation
- Don't see anything changing
- The proposed resolution states that the directors of the Health Department and the Department of Social Services retain the authority defined in North Carolina General Statute 108A-14 and 130A-41
- Will depend, if approved, on the advisory board of the two departments for decisions that I make

Vice Chairman Booth commented:

- Feel Commissioner Inman made some very good comments regarding the State Personnel Act
- Agree the County is very fortunate for the directors we currently have
- Agree with Commissioner Inman that the daily operation will basically stay the same

Commissioner Walker commented:

- For the record, I have had zero complaints on either the Health or Social Services Departments in so long that I can't remember when the last one actually was
- As far as Commissioner Jones's comment about "trying something new to see how it works", the odds are two out of three that anytime you make a change, it will not be improved; unless there is some guarantee or some specific reason that we can look at and say that it is going to be better
- The first thing is that you changed it but it is just different and not better
- The second thing is that you changed it and it is worse for some reason but you didn't know when you changed it
- The one out of three is you changed it and it is actually better
- The basic odds are two out of three that we don't improve something just by changing it
- One thing that has been a major concern for me all along, we have two functioning boards, as Commissioner Inman stated they have what appears to be doing a good job
- Both departments are working with two directors in place

- There doesn't seem to be a problem
- What is the reason for doing this, unless it is a personal preference for certain commissioners and the people that they listen to, whoever that might happen to be
- I don't know what the reason could be beyond that other than we can do it
- If we had problems, if we have issues, if we had special situations which as of the most recent information available, no county has made this change just to be making it that anyone is aware of in this area
- Every county that has made this change has had specific or certain circumstances that made this a good time to make a change
- No county has done it that anyone knows of just to be doing it like apparently we would be doing
- This Board has a variety of issues
- Folks here tonight have heard issue after issue come before this Board
- You have a Health Board that only hears health issues
- You have eleven dedicated people on that board
- You have five dedicated people on the DSS board that only address the DSS issues
- Common sense will tell us that those boards can keep up with those specific issues better than a general board that does everything and relies on maybe an advisory board
- One of the biggest things – no advisory board for DSS
- I could even consider supporting this along with the deficiencies, questions, etc. if there was a specific advisory board for Social Services
- There is a possibility of having three people on an eleven person board, but that leaves eight people with no connection to Social Services
- I don't know what the folks in Raleigh were thinking when they designed it this way
- I supported the initial concept
- I supported the initial concept because at one time I was getting a lot of complaints on certain functions within the county
- Where are those complaints now?
- It is obvious that it is going to happen
- I know how I am going to vote and I know why I am going to vote that way and I know I am going to sleep well tonight for voting that way
- It may work just fine
- Five people here and each person has their own way of making decisions
- I am not sure what brought this board to where it is on this decision at this time, but I hope for the sake of the people in these departments, I hope for the sake of the directors and most specifically for the folks, the most vulnerable people in our county; children, foster care, elderly, it works
- These are important decisions
- We all sitting here are making it in life and can figure it out to basically take care of ourselves
- But the Health Department and Social Services take care of the needs of those who are not at a particular time able to take care of themselves
- Feel we are taking a risk at this time
- Would like to see the current option stay in place

- Might be a time I could easily support it, it is just not this particular time
- I am not even certain why this board, based on no other board in this area that I am aware of and I have done some checking has made a change, unless there is some specific reason for making the change

Commissioner Jones responded to Commissioner Walker's comments:

- Understand what you are saying
- But if you don't try, you don't know if it can be any better
- You shut the door when you have a rare opportunity to make things better
- I know Director Lenhart and Director Preston came together to put together the two Boards (Child Protection and Child Fatality), it has been a great marriage
- So to condemn everything before you have a chance to try and to base it on the fact that there are no problems right now is not really fair
- Why would you want to try something knew when there are problems and chaos
- No better a time to try something new when things are better
- Disagree, but do have different thought processes
- I do think about everyone in this county
- I have worked with DSS for about a decade before I was a commissioner
- I know what goes on there and it is worrisome
- We have different thought processes

Commissioner Walker responded to Commissioner Jones' comments:

- The test that needs to be applied to certain issues is "does it meet the common sense test"
- Now it is nice to try new things, I wouldn't mind driving a \$450,000 Porsche to see what it is like, but I don't know if I necessarily want to go through the trouble to do it
- To say we will just try it to see if it works, rather than see us take a more planned, thorough approach to our decisions than just try it and see if it works

Commissioner Jones responded:

- It will unravel itself just fine, just have to have a little faith in all of us

Commissioner Inman commented:

- Don't think, if this Board passes this, that our Department of Social Services and Department of Public Health employees are going to quit serving the citizens of Stokes County; feel that is an accurate statement

Commissioner Walker stated that you have heard no one say that.

Commissioner Inman stated that is essentially what you said.

Commissioner Walker stated that he would like to see what the minutes reflect, don't

remember saying that.

Commissioner Inman commented:

- That is neither here or there
- Difference in an advisory board versus “the Board”, the advisory board is going to make the same recommendations to come this Board
- This Board is not taking over the departments at all, quite frankly don’t see that anything will change in the morning if the Board passes this, would be quite shocked if anything did change
- Have always supported both boards
- In 2002, when former commissioners wanted to trim and if had their way would have eliminated Social Services, I voted strongly against that
- Have had great service from those departments

Commissioner Walker responded:

- If we had those previous commissioners you are referring to, this would be the exact action they would be taking

Commissioner Inman responded:

- Resent that very much sir, was never a part of that

Chairman Lankford called the question.

The motion carried 4-1 with Commissioner Walker voting against the motion.

County Manager Morris stated that he felt it would be a prudent measure for this Board to do a separate motion that retains the two current directors for each department.

Chairman Lankford entertained a motion.

Commissioner Walker moved to retain the two current directors for each department.

Commissioner Inman seconded the motion.

Commissioner Walker commented:

- Another thing I meant to mention earlier
- How can you be handed something (resolution) one evening as important as this decision is, not even had a chance to think about the information given, the wording, what is in there, what should have been in there and go ahead and just do what we did
- I am glad it is in there that we can retain the directors

The motion carried unanimously.



## Appointments

Chairman Lankford presented the following nominees that were nominated at the May 28<sup>th</sup> meeting to serve on the Stokes County Community Child Protection and Child Fatality

### Prevention Team:

Team Member	Team position **indicates position required by statute	Appointed By:
Kristy Preston	**Director of the county department of social services	DSS Board
Scott Lenhart	**Director of the local department of of public health	Board of Health
Marsha Marshall	**Member of the DSS Director's Staff	DSS Director
Det. Kelly Craine	**Local law enforcement officer	Board of Commissioners
Sheriff Mike Marshall	**Local law enforcement officer	Board of Commissioners
Tom Langan	**Attorney from the district attorney's office	District Attorney
Jeannie Easter or Bridgett Stowe	**Executive director of the local community action agency or designee	Executive Director Community Action Agency
Todd Martin -Assist. Superintendent	**Superintendent or his designee	School Superintendent
Jan Culler or Frances Allen	**Member of county board of social services	DSS Board
Ed Eklund	**Local mental health professional	Local management entity
Jaime Kehoe	**Guardian ad Litem Coordinator	Guardian ad Litem Office
Dr. Sam Newsome	**Local health care provider County Medical Examiner	Board of Health Chief Medical Examiner
Greg Collins	** Emergency medical services provider or firefighter	Board of Commissioners
Judge Spencer Key	** District Court Judge	Chief Dist. Court Judge
Susan Hairston	**Representative of a local child care facility or Health Start Program	DSS Director
Thomas Sutton	Vacant-parent of a child who died before reaching their 18th birthday	Board of Commissioners
<b>Additional Appointees</b>		
Ronda Jones - CCPT	County Commissioner	Board of Commissioners
Jimmy Walker - CFPT	County Commissioner	Board of Commissioners
Martina Tunat	SIDS Counselor	Board of Commissioners
Rusty Slate or Jeana Barneycastle	Juvenile Services	Board of Commissioners
Clyde Stewart	Youth Counselor	Board of Commissioners
Tamara Veit	Prevention Agency	Board of Commissioners
Pam Hooker	Community Representative	Board of Commissioners
Shelia Bowen	Community Representative	Board of Commissioners

Team Coordinator

June 10, 2013

Chairman Lankford entertained a motion to close the nominations.

Commissioner Inman moved to close the nominations. Vice Chairman Booth seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

Chairman Lankford polled the Board.

Commissioner Jones: Nominees presented by Chairman Lankford  
 Commissioner Inman: Nominees presented by Chairman Lankford  
 Chairman Lankford: Nominees presented by Chairman Lankford  
 Vice Chairman Booth: Nominees presented by Chairman Lankford  
 Commissioner Walker: Nominees presented by Chairman Lankford

### **Health Department - Budget Amendment #96**

Chairman Lankford entertained a motion regarding Budget Amendment #96 which was added to tonight's Agenda:

To amend the General Fund, the expenditures are to be changed as follows:

Account Number	Account Description	Current Budgeted Amount	Increase (Decrease)	As Amended
<b>Health Department</b>				
110.5101.230	Medical Supplies (AH)	\$30,000.00	\$(4,325.00)	\$25,675.00
110.5101.511	Non Capital Equipment		\$4,325.00	\$4,325.00
110.5102.230	Medical Supplies (CH)	\$10,000.00	\$(1,775.00)	\$8,225.00
110.5102.511	Non Capital Equipment		\$1,775.00	\$1,775.00
110.5103.230	Medical Supplies (FP)	\$25,000.00	\$(3,880.00)	\$21,120.00
110.5103.511	Non Capital Equipment		\$3,880.00	\$3,880.00
110.5104.230	Medical Supplies (GEN)	\$27,325.00	\$(11,500.00)	\$15,825.00
110.5104.511	Non Capital Equipment	<u>\$350,000.00</u>	<u>\$11,500.00</u>	<u>\$361,500.00</u>
	<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$442,325.00</b>	<b>\$00.00</b>	<b>\$442,325.00</b>

This budget amendment is justified as follows:

To transfer funds to cover cost of supplies that will be categorized as "equipment" that is necessary for the start up of the Prenatal Clinic beginning in July 2013.

This will result in a net increase of \$00.00 in the expenditures and other financial use to the County's annual budget. To provide the additional revenue for the above, the following revenues

will increase. These revenues have already been received or are verified they will be received this fiscal year.

Vice Chairman Booth moved to approve Budget Amendment #96. Commissioner Inman seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

### **CLOSED SESSION**

Chairman Lankford entertained a motion to enter Closed Session for the following:

- To consult with an attorney employed or retained by the public body in order to preserve the attorney client privilege between the attorney and the public body, which privilege is hereby acknowledged pursuant to G.S. 143-311.11(a)(3)
- To consider the initial employment or appointment of an individual to any office or position, other than a vacancy in the Board of County Commissioners or any other public body, or to consider the qualifications, competence, performance, character, and fitness of any public officer or employee, other than a member of the Board of Commissioners or of some other public body pursuant to G.S. 143-318.11(6)

Commissioner Inman moved to enter into Closed Session for the following:

- To consult with an attorney employed or retained by the public body in order to preserve the attorney client privilege between the attorney and the public body, which privilege is hereby acknowledged pursuant to G.S. 143-311.11(a)(3)
- To consider the initial employment or appointment of an individual to any office or position, other than a vacancy in the Board of County Commissioners or any other public body, or to consider the qualifications, competence, performance, character, and fitness of any public officer or employee, other than a member of the Board of Commissioners or of some other public body pursuant to G.S. 143-318.11(6)

Vice Chairman Booth seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

The Board returned to the regular session of the June 10<sup>th</sup> meeting.

**Adjournment**

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

Vice Chairman Booth moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Walker seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

---

**Darlene M. Bullins**  
**Clerk to the Board**

---

**Ernest Lankford**  
**Chairman**