

**OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONERS  
STOKES COUNTY GOVERNMENT  
DANBURY, NORTH CAROLINA  
FEBRUARY 8, 2016**

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

Chairman Inman called the meeting to order and welcomed those in attendance today.

Chairman Inman invited those who wished to join in the invocation to please do so.

## GENERAL GOVERNMENT-GOVERNING BODY-PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

**1**

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

Chairman Inman entertained a motion to approve or amend the February 8, 2016 Agenda.

Commissioner Jones moved to approve the February 8<sup>th</sup> Agenda as presented.

Vice Chairman Booth seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

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

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

County Manager Rick Morris commented:

- Pioneer Community Hospital of Stokes
  - Pioneer will be consolidating services in King
    - Will be moving Dr. Newsome's office into the Medical Building beside the YMCA at the end of February
- League of Governments Meeting
  - Has been rescheduled for Thursday, February 25<sup>th</sup> at 6:30 pm with Town of Walnut Cove hosting

Commissioner Lankford commented:

- Ethics for Life "I have called upon You, O God, for You will hear me; incline Your ear to me and hear my speech" (Psalm)
- Piedmont Triad Regional Council (PTRC) announced that Stokes County Social Services would be receiving \$3,000 for Caregiver's Services
  - One time allocation
  - Should receive sometime between March and May this year

Vice Chairman Booth commented:

- Welcome everyone here today
- Would like to invite everyone to the Farmer's Appreciation Day which will be held on Tuesday, April 12, 2016 at North Stokes High School starting at 6:00 pm
- Saw grading equipment on the proposed site for the new Walmart in King

Commissioner Walker commented:

- Glad to see so many people here today
- Glad to see so many people interested in local government
- Very pleased to see equipment along the roads in Stokes County
  - It is for broadband
  - Hoping to be able to serve as many citizens and businesses as possible
  - Entire Board supports the expansion of broadband across the County

Commissioner Jones had no comments.

Chairman Inman commented:

- Attended a recent meeting at Hanging Rock State Park (along with County Manager Rick Morris and Vice Chairman Booth) with State Park officials, Senator Shirley Randleman and Representative Kyle Hall to discuss the future of plans for Camp Sertoma/Vade Mecum
  - Toured the facilities
  - Estimated to take approximately \$5 million to rehab
  - Governor McCrory is proposing a bond “Connect NC Bond” which will be discussed later in today’s meeting
    - If approved by the voters in March, Hanging Rock State Park will receive over \$2 million that will be used to rehab Camp Sertoma/Vade Mecum
- The primary focus of the broadband expansion will be to serve the un-served and underserved

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Chairman Inman noted that the Board of Commissioners will hear Public Comments, but will not respond to Public Comments and that each speaker will be allowed three (3) minutes.

The following spoke during Public Comments:

### **Texie Jessup**

6621 NC 89 W

Westfield, NC

Re: **Francisco Elementary School**

Ms. Jessup presented the following comments:

- Would like to encourage the Board to help the Francisco community in any way possible towards a reuse of the facility – Francisco Elementary School
- Even though Francisco is a very little “dot”, it really represents all of northwest Stokes County
- It is not just the school and that immediate area
- We also represent East Westfield, Asbury, Collinstown, and the Hart’s Store area
- Want the Board to remember, it is the whole area, not just Francisco
- There are a lot of groups that may have a use for the facility along with the grounds
- Several people are in attendance today to support the reuse of Francisco Elementary School

### **Trent Foddrell**

290 Foddrell Lane

Stuart, VA

Re: **Francisco Elementary School**

Mr. Foddrell presented the following comments:

- Live in Stuart, VA, but go to church in North Carolina
- Our church is located on Shuff Road
- We would like to see the Francisco Elementary School saved and be reused by others

- As superintendent of Sunday School at my church, I try to give kids a place to go for recreational activities instead of being on the streets
- Encouraging this Board to save the school and let it be used for community events

**Horace Stimson**

1931 Horseshoe Road

Westfield, NC

Re: **Francisco Elementary School**

Mr. Stimson presented the following comments:

- We were asked about the sense of the community regarding the school so we invited some of the leaders to today's meeting
- Would like to show the Board, at some point, how the Francisco School repurposing fits with a larger plan of activities that are ongoing – planning and execution, small steps, and the outcomes that have been going on since the school closed
- Steps that are being considered:
  - Visit some repurposed schools that are located in isolated areas where no one lives, but services are being offered and used
  - Would like to pass on a community meeting on Monday, February 15<sup>th</sup> at which time we will be reviewing with all the teams that have been established to see what they have and if it ties in with the facility
  - Will be looking at the priorities
  - Would like to provide that information from our meeting to the Board before the next Board meeting
  - In March, would like to develop a blueprint with steps through the end of June 2016
  - Will be looking at the facility and what is required, obtaining a lot of different information
  - Will also be getting professional help
  - Will be looking at each organization to see who cares and what they can offer
  - Would like to do some one-on-one surveys in order to pin down who is going to need space, what they are going to need it for, when they will need it and how they will contribute to see if it is going to be a sustainable facility
- We are taking steps, as a community, to create plans with a view towards execution, feasibility, reality, and sustainability

Chairman Inman noted that later in today's meeting, the Board of Commissioners will be discussing the Conveyance of the Francisco Elementary School Property from the Board of Education to the Board of Commissioners; the Board will not be discussing what the facility will be used for at today's meeting.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

Chairman Inman entertained a motion to approve or amend the following items on the

Consent Agenda:

- Minutes of January 25, 2016 – Regular Meeting

**Proposed Proclamation – Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Month – February 2016**

DSS Director Stacey Elmes, on behalf of YVEDDI Domestic Violence, presented the following proposed Proclamation – Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Month – February 2016 for the Board's review and approval:

**TEEN DATING VIOLENCE AWARENESS AND PREVENTION MONTH  
FEBRUARY 2016  
A PROCLAMATION**

**WHEREAS**, females between the ages of 16-24 are more vulnerable to intimate partner violence, experiencing abuse at a rate almost triple the national average; and

**WHEREAS**, one in three adolescent girls in the United States is a victim of physical, emotional or verbal abuse from a dating partner, a figure that far exceeds victimization rates for other types of violence affecting youth; and

**WHEREAS**, high school students who experience physical violence in a dating relationship are more likely to use drugs and alcohol, are at greater risk of suicide and are much more likely to carry patterns of abuse into future relationships; and

**WHEREAS**, youth people victimized by a dating partner are more likely to engage in risky sexual behavior and unhealthy dieting behaviors and the experience may not disrupt normal development of self-esteem and body image; and

**WHEREAS**, nearly half of teens who experience dating violence report that incidents of abuse took place in a school building or on school grounds; and

**WHEREAS**, only 33% of teens who are in an abusive relationship ever tell anyone about the abuse, and 81% of parents surveyed either believe teen dating violence is not an issue or admit they do not know if it is one; and

**WHEREAS**, by providing young people with education about healthy relationships and relationship skills and by changing attitudes that support violence, we recognize that dating violence can be prevented; and

**WHEREAS**, it is essential to raise community awareness and to provide training for teachers, counselors and school staff so that they may recognize when youth are exhibiting signs of dating violence; and

**WHEREAS**, the establishment of Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Month will benefit young people, their families, schools and communities regardless of socioeconomic status, gender, sexual orientation or ethnicity; and

**WHEREAS**, everyone has the right to a safe and healthy relationship and to be free from abuse.

**NOW THEREFORE**, We, the **Board of County Commissioners of Stokes County** do hereby proclaim **February 2016 to be Teen Dating Violence Awareness and Prevention Month**, throughout Stokes County, North Carolina. We urge every resident to work toward ending teen dating violence by empowering young people to develop healthier relationships, assisting victims in accessing the information and supportive services they need, creating better and more resources for young people in need, instituting effective intervention and prevention policies in schools and engaging in discussions with family members and peers to promote awareness and prevention of the quiet epidemic of teen dating violence.

Dated this 8<sup>th</sup> day of **February 2016**.

---

**Chairman J. Leon Inman**

---

**Vice-Chairman James D. Booth**

---

**Commissioner Jimmy Walker**

---

**Commissioner Ernest Lankford**

---

**Commissioner Ronda Jones**

---

**Clerk to the Board Darlene**

**Proposed Resolution – Authorization for Sale of County Issued Service Side Arm for J. Ricki Stevens**

Sheriff Mike Marshall presented the following proposed Resolution – Authorization for Sale of County Issued Service Side Arm for J. Ricki Stevens who will be retiring March 1, 2016 for the Board's review and approval:

**Resolution authorizing sale of County issued service side arm:  
(North Carolina General Statute 20-187.2.A)**

**WHEREAS**, Deputy II James Ricki Stevens is retiring from the Stokes County Sheriff's Department on February 28, 2016; and

**WHEREAS**, Deputy II James Ricki Stevens has been a dedicated fulltime law enforcement officer to the citizens of Stokes County for 11+ years; and

**WHEREAS**, North Carolina General Statute 20-187.2 (a), permits Stokes County to donate the badge worn at no cost, and to the sell service issued side arm to retiring law enforcement officers, at a price determined by the Board of Commissioners; and

**THEREFORE, THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF STOKES COUNTY RESOLVES THAT:**

1. The Sheriff of Stokes County is authorized to present to Deputy II James Ricki Stevens his Stokes County Sheriff's Department issued badge at no cost.
2. The Sheriff of Stokes County is also authorized to sell a Smith & Wesson Model M&P 40 caliber semi-auto handgun, serial number DWJ3305 and holster at a set price of \$1.00 to Deputy II James Ricki Stevens after securing a permit as required by North Carolina General Statute 14-402 or 14-409.

Adopted this the 8<sup>th</sup> day of February 2016.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**J. Leon Inman - Chairman**

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Jimmy Walker - Commissioner**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Ernest Lankford - Commissioner**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Ronda Jones – Commissioner**

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Darlene Bullins – Clerk to the Board**

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

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

Chairman Inman noted there were no items on today's Information Agenda.

**GENERAL GOVERNMENT – GOVERNING BODY – DISCUSSION AGENDA**

**Revised Project Description/Budget – Pilot View RC&D/Resource Institute – Additional Sewer Work Funded by Cost Savings**

County Manager Rick Morris presented the following comments regarding the Revised Project Description/Budget submitted by Pilot View RC&D/Resource Institute:

- Project Coordinator Charles Anderson is here today with another proposal, as requested by the Board of Commissioners, which takes all county funding out of the proposed budget/project
- If the Board chooses to move forward with the proposal, will be providing the Board with an Addendum at the February 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting for consideration

- The proposed Animal Adoption Center to be constructed at the old prison camp is being held up until this issue is resolved
- This project directly impacts the construction of the adoption center and how sewer will be provided for the new adoption center
- If the sewer has to come in from the back of the proposed facility instead of Dodgetown Road, there will be additional money needed to get the sewer to the facility and not sure where that funding will come from

Project Coordinator Charles Anderson presented the following information regarding the

Revised Project Description/Budget for additional sewer construction:

- Project Budget = \$3,571,787
- Expenses to date (Jan 2016) = \$2,744,734
- Remaining project budget funding available for Phase IIA = \$387,766
- Sewer Phase IIA Projected Budget:
  - Sewer Construction = \$210,000
  - Construction Contingency (20%) = \$42,000
  - Design/Engineering/Permitting & Directs = \$30,183
  - Construction Oversight = \$34,245
  - New Survey = \$2,915
  - Project Management, Administration and Grant Management = \$68,423
  - Total proposed budget = \$387,766
- Revenue
  - ARC = \$236,391
  - Forsyth Tech = \$116,843
  - NCDOT = \$34,532
  - Stokes County = \$0
  - Total revenue = \$387,766
- Reiterated there is no county funding in the revised budget
- In the process of closing out the Golden LEAF Grant, should be closeout within the next two weeks
- The proposed budget will allow approximately 1,100 ft. of sewer construction from the intersection of HWY #8 & #89 up Dodgetown Road to where the new animal adoption center will be located
- Will have to dig and reinstall a few hundred feet due to the elevation up Dodgetown Road

Chairman Inman opened the floor for discussion.

Commissioner Jones commented:

- My sentiments are the same as before, ready to move forward
- Feel even if there was a county cost share, it would be worth it

Commissioner Walker commented:

- How and when was the amount of \$116,843 identified as Forsyth Tech funds?



Coordinator Anderson responded:

- That was the remaining dollars from all the funders – Golden LEAF, ARC, Forsyth Tech, NCDOT, DENR/DWI

Commissioner Walker continued:

- Speaking specifically about the \$116,843 identified as Forsyth Tech dollars

Coordinator Anderson responded:

- That is the remaining funds from the \$250,000 from Forsyth Tech
- This is the funding from the State that was passed thru Forsyth Tech

Commissioner Walker continued:

- Understand that Forsyth Tech was invoiced by Stokes County in the amount of \$253,000 and Forsyth Tech paid Stokes County \$250,000
- Questioned if the remaining funding is Forsyth Tech's or Stokes County's?

Coordinator Anderson responded:

- It is state funding that was passed thru Forsyth Tech
- If those dollars are not used, will have to be returned

Commissioner Walker continued:

- Originally, the \$250,000 was intended to be used exclusively for Forsyth Tech
- Running a sewer extension to an animal shelter, which I totally support, is not Forsyth Tech purposes

County Manager Morris interjected that Commissioner Walker was putting incorrect information out and clarified that this extension is part of the project.

Commissioner Walker noted that he had the floor at this time and was asking Coordinator Anderson questions about the revised project.

Commissioner Walker requested point of order from the Chairman.

Commissioner Walker continued:

- If the \$250,000 passed thru Forsyth Tech is not for Forsyth Tech purposes, then I have been misinformed

Coordinator Anderson responded:

- In the future, the county may want to run the sewer line up to the entrance of the community college for additional buildings
- In that case, this would be another access point

Commissioner Walker continued:

- I am not saying that there is no good that can come from putting additional sewer pipe in the ground

- Just have a lot of questions about the this particular set of numbers – Forsyth Tech dollars

Coordinator Anderson responded:

- Look at it this way
- You have “x” amount of dollars for “x” amount of work
- Those dollars can be moved around
- It does not matter, it is still dollars for the project
- You can call the dollars Golden LEAF, Forsyth Tech, etc.
- You will get the same amount of work
- Funders are looking at the total objective of the project and if that objective was met

Vice Chairman Booth commented:

- I have a little problem of construction oversight of \$34,245 for only 1,100 ft.
- I am willing to go \$25,000 for construction oversight, no more

Coordinator Anderson responded:

- Wish that was negotiable, but that is the engineer’s fees

Vice Chairman Booth continued:

- Is he the only engineer in the State that can do the project?
- Is that the normal price for only 1,100 feet?

Coordinator Anderson responded:

- He is the engineer that did the initial construction
- It is not just 1,100 ft. of new construction
- There is approximately 300 ft. of pipe that must be removed, field re-surveyed, and the pipe put back in the ground

Vice Chairman Booth continued:

- Confirmed with Coordinator Anderson that someone from the engineer firm is on site each day until the construction is finished
- Confirmed with Coordinator Anderson that construction could take between 90 to 120 days for this 1,100 ft. on sewer lines
- Have a problem with the \$68,423 for project management, administration, and grant management
- If you add the \$68,423 (project management, administration, and grant management) and the \$34,245 (construction oversight) together, it is 54% of the construction cost

Coordinator Anderson responded:

- Out of the \$68,423, Michelle Suverkrubbe (Environmental Specialist) who assists Pilot View/Resource Institute with all the grant management (reporting, closing, etc.) has to be paid
- There is only about 11.5% of the total project cost going to Resource Institute
- With the initial project, there was an agreement for Resource Institute fee of 12%, but only charged 4.5% of the total project cost
- Pilot View/Resource Institute actually lost money on the initial construction project

Vice Chairman Booth continued:

- Michelle has already been paid for the original project for administration of the grants
- Should only be one grant left with the Golden LEAF being closed within the next few weeks

Coordinator Anderson responded:

- Golden LEAF is not closed out yet
- NCDOT and Forsyth Tech, along with ARC, has to be also closed out

Vice Chairman Booth continued:

- Confirmed with Coordinator Anderson that Michelle's fee will be approximately \$18,000 for the 1,100 ft. of new construction with the balance going to Pilot View/Resource Institute for their services
- Willing to go around \$50,000 for project management, administration, and grant management, not \$68,423

Coordinator Anderson responded:

- Wish we could help you out with that, but it is what it is
- Have provided the Board what was requested – a project for extension of sewer lines using grant funding and no county funding
- In the last projection, the \$68,423 was \$108,000, it has been reduced

Vice Chairman Booth continued:

- Confirmed with Coordinator Anderson that there is no negotiations
- Feel 54% is extremely high for construction oversight and project management, administration and grant management

Coordinator Anderson responded:

- There is a lot more to this than just construction oversight, it is dealing with inspectors and engineers a lot of times on a daily basis

Commissioner Lankford commented:

- Have followed this pretty close
- Appears to me that our objective has been met with not having any Stokes County tax dollars in this expansion and then also a reduction in a lot of the costs
- The Forsyth Tech is very understandable and don't understand why someone can't understand it
- Makes sense to me
- Ready to put the item on the Action Agenda for the next meeting and make it happen

Commissioner Walker commented:

- In recognizing the extensive Agenda today, will keep my further questions for the next meeting for the sake of time

Vice Chairman Booth commented:

- Confirmed with Coordinator Anderson that if the contingency of \$42,000 is not used, it can be used for other items dealing with the construction of the Forsyth Tech facility
- Confirmed with Coordinator Anderson that leftover funding can't be used to reimburse the County for design services already completed and paid for by the County

County Manager Morris responded:

- In the law, it states that funding was only to be used for the purpose of building and equipping the Stokes County multi-campus site
- If it falls within those parameters, it can be used

Vice Chairman Booth commented:

- If there is any funding left of the \$116,843, it can be used for Forsyth Tech
- Want it understand that we won't lose it or have to return it back to the State, we can use it for the new Forsyth Tech facility

Coordinator Anderson responded:

- Must remember, the construction cost is only an estimate
- Construction cost could come in much higher

Chairman Inman commented:

- Confirmed with Coordinator Anderson that all the funding from the grantors was pooled together and it could just as easily been shown that the leftover was from the Golden LEAF funding
- For example, if several of us pooled \$250,000 each for an estimated \$1 million project and it only cost \$750,000, the remaining \$250,000 would be equally divided between those who participated
- Appreciate all the information provided by Coordinator Anderson

The Board agreed to place the item on the Action Agenda at the next meeting.

Chairman Inman, with full consent of the Board, directed the Clerk to place the item on the February 22<sup>nd</sup> Action Agenda.

### **Tax Administration Report – January 2016**

Tax Administrator Jake Oakley presented the following informational data for the

January 2016 Report:

<b>Fiscal Year 2015-16</b>	<b>Budget Amt</b>	<b>Collected Amt</b>	<b>Over Budget</b>	<b>Under Budget</b>
<b>Current 2015 Taxes Percentage = 0.9512%</b>	\$20,083,177.00	\$19,103,090.75		\$980,086.25
	\$1,295,689.00	\$1,255,503.58		\$40,185.42

February 8, 2016

12

**New Schools F-Tech Fund**  
**Percentage = 0.9690%**

**Prior Taxes**

County Regular & Motor  
Vehicles

\$675,000.00

\$276,976.96

\$398,023.04

**Percentage = 0.4103%**

**Business and Personal Property Discovery  
Report**

**Audit Dates**

**Accts**

**Total Value**

**Taxes Due**

(01-01-16/01-31-16)

11

\$57,210.00

\$519.13

(07-01-15/06-30-16)

202

\$905,838.00

\$8,125.45

**Motor Vehicle Release Report**

**Audit Dates**

Assessment through NC

Department of Motor Vehicles

**Garnishment Totals**

Month	Total Accounts	Original Levy Amount	Collected Amount
(01-1-16/01-31-16)	103	\$39,306.84	\$13,321.06
<b>F/Year 2015-16</b>			
(07-1-15/6-30-16)	276	\$256,940.29	\$120,039.38

**Interstate Collection Report**

**Collection**

**Total Collected**

January 2016

Cumulative Total Collected to Date

NC Debt Setoff

**\$235,662.26**

Cumulative Total Collected (to date)

Motor Vehicles

\$137,147.46

Cumulative Total Collected (to date)

Property Taxes

\$50,643.41

Cumulative Total Collected (to date)

EMS

\$317,039.55

Collected (to date)

All Categories

**\$504,830.42**

**Collection of New State Motor Vehicle Billings**

Tax Administrator Jake Oakley presented the following Collection of New State Motor Vehicle Billing for the Board's review:

- Graph shows each month's collection per taxing codes: **December 2015**  
**New VTS System**

Tax Code	Levy	Interest	Adjustment	Billing	Net
Jurisdiction	Billed	Paid	Made	Cost	Collected
City of King	\$16,778	\$108	-\$26	-\$1,065	\$15,795
King Car Fee	\$2,090	\$16	None	None	\$2,106

Walnut Cove Town	\$1,260	\$7	None	-\$69	\$1,198
Danbury Town	\$107	None	None	-\$5	\$102
School Tax	\$10,023	\$69	-\$25	-\$562	\$9,505
King Fire	\$2,540	\$17	-\$3	-\$143	\$2,411
Rural Hall Fire	\$472	\$4	-\$3	-\$26	\$447
Walnut Cove Fire	\$1,749	\$9	-\$1	-\$97	\$1,660
General County	\$155,225	\$1,049	-\$386	-\$8,702	\$147,186
Service Fire	\$9,750	\$68	-\$31	-\$547	\$9,240
<b>Total Collected</b>	<b>\$199,994</b>	<b>\$1,347</b>	<b>(\$475)</b>	<b>(\$11,216)</b>	<b>\$189,650</b>

- Cost in the New VTS System is calculated in all areas of billing (staffing, contracting, postage, DMV, software, etc.) by the NC Department of Revenue and prorated on each taxing district per bill
- Cost in car fees for the City of King is calculated in the City of King Bills

**CUMULATIVE COLLECTION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015-16**  
**NC Vehicle Tax System Summary per Tax District)**

<b>Total Cumulative Collected to date (NCVTS) system</b>	City of King/Car fee	\$114,660.00
<b>Total Vehicles Billed Per Tax Code 2,883</b>	Total Expenses	<u>\$(5,438.00)</u>
<b>Average Cost per Bill = \$1.89</b>	Total Net Collected	\$109,222.00
<b>Total Cumulative Collected to date (NCVTS) system</b>	Town of Walnut Cove	\$14,999.00
<b>Total Vehicles Billed Per Tax Code 608</b>	Total Expenses	<u>\$(713.00)</u>
<b>Average Cost per Bill = \$1.17</b>	Total Net Collected	\$14,286.00
<b>Total Cumulative Collected to date (NCVTS) system</b>	Town of Danbury	\$896.00
<b>Total Vehicles Billed Per Tax Code 62</b>	Total Expenses	<u>\$(39.00)</u>
<b>Average Cost per Bill = \$0.63</b>	Total Net Collected	\$857.00
<b>Total Cumulative Collected to date (NCVTS) system</b>	F Tech/School Fund	\$68,501.00
<b>Total Vehicles Billed Per Tax Code 25,318</b>	Total Expenses	<u>\$(3,192.00)</u>
<b>Average Cost per Bill = \$0.13</b>	Total Net Collected	\$65,309.00
<b>Total Cumulative Collected to date (NCVTS) system</b>	King Fire District	\$18,149.00
<b>Total Vehicles Billed Per Tax Code 3,810</b>	Total Expenses	<u>\$(863.00)</u>
<b>Average Cost per Bill = \$0.23</b>	Total Net Collected	\$17,286.00
<b>Total Cumulative Collected to date (NCVTS) system</b>	Rural Hall Fire District	\$3,477.00
<b>Total Vehicles Billed Per Tax Code 733</b>	Total Expenses	<u>\$(162.00)</u>
<b>Average Cost per Bill = \$0.22</b>	Total Net Collected	\$3,315.00
<b>Total Cumulative Collected to date (NCVTS) system</b>	Walnut Cove Fire Dist.	\$12,045.00
<b>Total Vehicles Billed Per Tax Code 2,766</b>	Total Expenses	<u>\$(559.00)</u>
<b>Average Cost per Bill = \$0.20</b>	Total Net Collected	\$11,486.00

<b>Total Cumulative Collected to date (NCVTS) system</b>	General County	\$1,044,508.00
<b>Total Vehicles Billed Per Tax Code 25,318</b>	Total Expenses	<u>\$(48,779.00)</u>
<b>Average Cost per Bill = \$1.93</b>	Total Net Collected	\$995,729.00

<b>Total Cumulative Collected to date (NCVTS) system</b>	Service Fire District	\$63,215.00
<b>Total Vehicles Billed Per Tax Code 14,524</b>	Total Expenses	<u>\$(2,936.00)</u>
<b>Average Cost per Bill = \$0.20</b>	Total Net Collected	\$60,279.00

<b>Total Cumulative Collected NCVTS through December (all tax districts)</b>	<b>\$1,340,450.00</b>
<b>Total Expenses for NCVTS through December (all tax districts)</b>	<b>\$(62,681.00)</b>
<b>Total net collected for NCVTS through December (all tax districts)</b>	<b>\$1,277,769.00</b>
<b>Average cost per total billings through November</b>	<b>\$2.47 per bill</b>

**Lowest cost billed = \$2.26 (County, School Fund, Service Fire) (based on 25,318 cars)**  
**Highest cost billed = \$3.95 (County, School Fund, King City based on 2,883 cars)**

#### **EMS Billing & Collections for Fiscal Year 2015-16**

Tax Administrator Jake Oakley presented the following EMS Billing & Collections Report for Fiscal Year 2015-16 for the Board's review:

	Transports			Medicare Medicaid Non Billable*	Other Non Billable*	Collection Rate
Month	Billed	Charged	Collected			
Jul-15	451	\$264,725.10	\$140,364.35	\$44,654.00	\$5,450.71	53.02%
Aug-15	235	\$136,920.60	\$121,859.97	\$52,114.81		89.00%
Sep-15	531	\$312,070.00	\$123,758.91	\$67,180.42	\$1,248.97	39.66%
Oct-15	463	\$277,229.80	\$135,206.53	\$73,293.22	\$1,585.07	48.77%
Nov-15	284	\$170,135.80	\$131,446.96	\$52,921.82	\$573.90	77.26%
Dec-15	294	\$175,245.10	\$122,491.88	\$42,150.10	\$154.37	69.90%
Jan-16	403	\$254,929.33	\$100,256.21	\$50,000.25	\$782.48	39.33%
Feb-16						
Mar-16						
Apr-16						
May-16						
Jun-16						
Totals	2,661	\$1,591,255.73	\$875,384.81	\$382,314.62	\$9,795.50	55.01%

Non Billable are contractual obligation, amount for which the patient can't be billed  
August – decreased billed and charged due to increase in collection of property taxes

#### **Releases Less than \$100 – Real and Personal Property**

Tax Administrator Jake Oakley presented the following Releases less than \$100 –  
Real and Personal Property (January 2016) at the February 8<sup>th</sup> meeting for the Board's review:

**Releases Less Than  
\$100 - Real/Personal  
Property**

Name	Bill No	Amount
Sharon Lawson	8481-2015-2015	\$18.62
Ricky Fulk	283168-2015-2015	\$40.27
Ricky Fulk	283168-2014-2014	\$36.56
Todd A Thornton	283783-2015	<u>\$59.11</u>
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$154.56</b>

**Releases More than \$100 – Real and Personal Property**

Tax Administrator Jake Oakley presented the following Releases more than \$100 –  
Real and Personal Property (January 2016) at the February 8<sup>th</sup> meeting for the Board's review  
with consideration at the February 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting:

**Releases More Than  
\$100 - Real/Personal  
Property**

Name	Bill No	Amount	
Beverly A H Seaman	307962-2015-2015	\$291.27	DWHM being rebilled to another owner as personal property
Ricky & M Beth Fulk	297912-2015-2015	\$197.34	Listed in Error
Brewer's Excavating Inc.	1313-2015-2015	\$345.80	Listed in Error
	1313-2014-2014	\$344.18	Listed in Error
	1314-2013-2013	\$347.08	Listed in Error
	1314-2012-2012	\$339.89	Listed in Error
	1313-2011-2011	<u>\$339.91</u>	Listed in Error
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$2,205.47</b>	

**Refunds More than \$100 – Real and Personal Property**

Tax Administrator Jake Oakley presented the following Refunds more than \$100 –  
Real and Personal Property (January 2016) at the February 8<sup>th</sup> meeting for the Board's review



with consideration at the February 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting:

**Refunds More Than  
\$100 - Real/Personal  
Property**

Name	Bill No	Amount	Reason
Larry W Brown	28344518-2015	\$207.91	Sold vehicle
Jay Middlebrook	21856110-2015	\$313.47	Sold vehicle
John Murphy Styles III	27845443-2015	<u>\$117.99</u>	Sold vehicle
Total		<b>\$639.37</b>	

Tax Administrator Oakley noted:

- Business is as usual in the Tax Office
- Collections are good
- Have collected approximately 95% of what was estimated in the FY 2015-16 Budget
- Have collected approximately 91% of what was actually billed

**Write Off - EMS Billing**

Tax Administrator Oakley requested the following EMS Billing Write Off at the February 8<sup>th</sup> meeting for the Board's review with consideration at the February 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting:

**EMS Write Off  
Request**

**January-16**

Call Number	Date	Charge Amount	Reason
E15-03117	4/19/2015	\$ 715.00	Inmate - No Insurance
E15-09032	11/14/2015	\$ 483.00	Inmate - No Insurance
E15-09140	11/18/2015	\$ 715.00	Inmate - No Insurance
E15-09273	11/23/2015	\$ 586.20	Inmate - No Insurance
E15-09309	11/25/2015	\$1,304.00	Inmate - No Insurance*
E15-09483	12/1/2015	<u>\$ 368.00</u>	Inmate - No Insurance
<b>Total Write Off</b>		<b>\$ 4,171.20</b>	

\*Inmate transported to Central  
Prison in Raleigh

Tax Administrator Oakley noted the following:

- There is no further recourse of collection
- County is actually responsible for providing these services

Tax Administrator Oakley requested the following be placed on the February 22<sup>nd</sup>

Consent Agenda for consideration for approval:

- Release More Than \$100 – Real and Personal Property
- Refunds More than \$100 – Real and Personal Property
- EMS Billing – Write Off

Chairman Inman opened the floor for discussion.

Commissioner Lankford confirmed with Tax Administrator Oakley that there is absolutely no other means for any further collection of inmate charges.

Tax Administrator Oakley noted that if the Board chose not to write off the EMS Billing for inmate charges, the county is responsible for paying the bills.

Commissioner Walker commented:

- At the last meeting, you mentioned that your staff was more stressed than usual because of working with the new software
- Would like an update

Tax Administrator Oakley responded:

- Still in the process of getting use to the new system
- The 2015 bills were billed on the new software system
- In the process of listing for the 2016 bills
- In the process of running the revaluation that will go live for 2017
- Getting ready to send out second notices for the first time
- Anytime you change systems, it is going to be stressful
- This software system is a robust system
- Employees are working hard to become familiar with the new system
- Very proud of the employees in the Tax Office
- They have done an exceptional job in adapting to the new software

The Board had no issues with the January Tax Report submitted by Tax Administrator Oakley.

Chairman Inman, with full consent of the Board, directed the Clerk to place the following items on the February 22<sup>nd</sup> Consent Agenda:

- Release More Than \$100 – Real and Personal Property
- Refunds More than \$100 – Real and Personal Property
- Write Off Request - EMS Billing

### Advertisement of 2015 Tax Liens

Tax Administrator Jake Oakley presented the following information regarding the

#### Advertisement of 2015 Tax Liens:

- NC General Statute 105-369(a) requires the Tax Collector to report to the governing body a total amount of unpaid taxes for the current fiscal year (2015-16) that are liens on real property including county and municipalities
- The governing body must order the Tax Collector to advertise these tax liens
- According to NC General Statute 105-369(b1), after the governing body orders the Tax Collector to advertise the tax liens, the Tax Collector must send a notice to the owner of record of each affected parcel
- The notice must be sent to the owner's last known address by first class mail at least thirty (30) days before the date of advertisement is to be published
- Projected date for mailing of second notices is February 26, 2016
- Requesting the governing body order the Tax Office to advertise these accounts no earlier than thirty (30) days after the mailing of past due notices (less any bills paid between the report date and the advertising date)
- Projected advertisement date for 2015 liens in the Stokes News is April 7, 2016
- Request the reported Delinquent 2015 Tax Bills be placed on the February 22<sup>nd</sup> Consent Agenda and the governing body orders the Tax Collector to advertise these delinquent tax liens

Tax Administrator Oakley presented the following Delinquent 2015 Tax Bills:

<b>Delinquent 2015 Tax Bills</b>	<b>Number of bills</b>	<b>Principal Due</b>
General County	4,009	\$ 1,538,059.31
Education Fund	4,009	\$ 99,235.23
Town of Danbury	12	\$ 931.75
City of King	198	\$ 111,874.37
Town of Walnut Cove	89	\$ 22,348.52
King Fire District	386	\$ 19,232.07
Rural Hall Fire District	103	\$ 4,198.64
County Service Fire District	277	\$ 108,860.54
Walnut Cove Fire District	460	\$ 18,976.78
<b>Total Bills Delinquent</b>	<b>4,009</b>	<b>\$ 1,923,717.21</b>

Chairman Inman opened the floor for discussion.

The Board had no issues with the Advertisement of 2015 Tax Liens.

Chairman Inman, with full consent of the Board, directed the Clerk to place the

Advertisement of 2015 Tax Liens on the February 22<sup>nd</sup> Consent Agenda.

### **Social Services Monthly Report**

DSS Director Stacey Elmes presented the following Social Services Monthly Report:

- Program Updates
  - County Oversight Report from Division of Health and Human Service- Adult Care Licensure Section
    - Monitors the DSS activity with the Adult Care Homes in the County
    - Currently, there were no issues found from the second quarter review conducted on January 13, 2016
- As of January 2016:
  - Income Maintenance
    - NC FAST – In Compliance
    - WorkFirst – In Compliance
    - FNS – In Compliance
    - Adult Medicaid – In Compliance
    - Family and Children’s Medicaid – In Compliance
    - Child Support – In Compliance
    - Program Integrity – In Compliance
    - Appeal Hearings and Fraud Hearings – In Compliance
  - Day Care – In Compliance
  - Foster Care
    - Foster Care Services – Needs Improvement
      - Case load numbers continue to grow
      - New staff still learning
    - Foster Care Home Licensing – In Compliance
    - Adoptions – In Compliance
  - Child Protective Services
    - Investigations – In Compliance
    - Case Management – In Compliance
    - Adult Services
      - Adult Protective Services – In Compliance
      - Guardianship– In Compliance
      - SSBG/HCCBG/Payee/Adult Day– In Compliance
      - Family/Monitoring– In Compliance
      - SA IH/MAC– In Compliance
      - CAP DA/CAP C– In Compliance
      - Intake– In Compliance
      - Caseloads– In Compliance
  - Supervision (Staff/Supervisor Ratio)- Needs Improvement
    - Not enough supervisors to adequately manage employees and quality assurance
    - Supervisors are more like line workers because of program growth
  - Staffing (Years of Service) – In Compliance
  - Medicaid Transportation – In Compliance

- Clerical – In Compliance

DSS Director Elmes noted the metrics is the same as last month.

Chairman Inman opened the floor for discussion.

Commissioner Walker confirmed with DSS Director Elmes, that there is nothing at this time that needs attention based on the information provided at today's meeting.

Chairman Inman expressed appreciation to Director Elmes for the monthly report.

### **Reclassification – Social Services**

County Manager Rick Morris presented the following request from DSS Director Stacey Elmes regarding a reclassification request:

- Request a vacant Social Work Supervisor III position be reclassified from its current salary grade of 74 to an Income Maintenance Administrator I grade 73
- The net effect of this change will be a decrease of about \$3,314 per year in the agency's overall budget
- The position is funded with federal, state, and county dollars
- The reason for this request is that the position is vacant and has become clear that the changing duties of this position requires that a change be made
- In consultation with the Office of State Human Resources, it is believed that the new duties are more closely aligned with those of an Income Maintenance Administrator I as opposed to a Social Work Supervisor III job description
- Believe the net effect of the reclassification will improve the department's ability to serve the citizens of Stokes County and will improve efficiencies within our agency along with being more in line with our organizational needs
- Would request the item be placed on the February 22<sup>nd</sup> Action Agenda for consideration

DSS Director Elmes noted:

- As Manager Morris noted the Social Work Supervisor III is currently vacant
- The former employee has taken a job in Guilford County for more money
- With NCFAS, this position has become more economic services
- Easier to reclassify when the position is vacant especially since the grade is being lowered
- Believe that this reclassification better aligns the duties of the job

Chairman Inman opened the floor for discussion.

Vice Chairman Booth commented:

- Confirmed with DSS Director that changing this position from a supervisor to an administrator will not impact the staff/supervisor ratio listed on the metric report

DSS Director Elmes responded:

- That will not impact Income Maintenance, it will stay the same
- The problem with supervision is in Children's Services

Chairman Inman, with full consent of the Board, directed the Clerk to place the item on the February 22<sup>nd</sup> Action Agenda.

#### **Job Description Title Change – Senior Services**

County Manager Rick Morris presented the following information regarding a request from Senior Services Program Director Vicki East regarding a Job Description Title Change:

- Requesting a job description title change for the position of Walnut Cove Senior Center Director which will be vacant with the retiring of the current director
- Would request the title be changed to Walnut Cove Senior Center Coordinator
- The Walnut Cove Senior Center has been under the umbrella of Stokes County Senior Services since Vicki East was promoted to Director
- Director East does the budgeting for both departments
- Feel the job description title change would better reflect the current position
- No change in grade or salary
- Would request the item be placed on the February 22<sup>nd</sup> Action Agenda for consideration

Chairman Inman opened the floor for discussion.

The Board had no issues with the request.

Chairman Inman, with full consent of the Board, directed the Clerk to place the item on the February 22<sup>nd</sup> Action Agenda.

#### **Conveyance of the Francisco Elementary School Property – Further Discussion**

County Manager Rick Morris noted the following regarding the Conveyance of the Francisco Elementary School Property to the County of Stokes:

- As the Board is aware, the Board of Education has requested an answer from the Board of Commissioners regarding the transfer of ownership of Francisco Elementary School

- Provided the following additional information regarding the Septic System:
  - Current septic system installed in 1980 to serve 200 students
    - Existing septic tank (pre-1980)
    - Sand filter bed, 330' of drainline, 600 gallon pump pit, handmade grease trap
    - Location of drainfield unknown – possibly on adjacent property
    - To put in perspective; existing drainfield is smaller than what is currently required for a 3-bedroom home
    - There is no designated repair area
    - Some soil has already been deemed unsuitable for septic (ballfield)
    - Logical, next step would be to have a soil scientist map the property to determine if any areas would support further sewer expansion
  - Any use other than school use would cause the loss of grandfather status
  - Future use:
    - Need detailed plan in order to determine potential amount of wastewater generated per day
    - Current permit could remain valid for 300 gallons of wastewater/day
    - Required to contract with certified operator to maintain the system due to the filter bed
    - Unable to speculate on possible expansion of system without detailed plan
  - Kitchen has lost grandfather status
    - Would have to meet current code to be used for cafeteria, senior meals, or anything else where food is sold
    - Major items of kitchen equipment have been removed by the school system
- At this time, four commissioners have done a walk through the school
- The one remaining commissioner is working to schedule a time to visit the school within the next week or so

Chairman Inman noted that Board of Education Member Bill Hart was in the audience for today's meeting.

Chairman Inman questioned Member Hart if he had any comments at this time.

Member Hart responded:

- The Board of Education is awaiting the Board of Commissioners' decision

Chairman Inman opened the floor for discussion.

Commissioner Jones commented:

- Still in the fact finding mode

Commissioner Walker commented:

- Feel like I think my other commissioners do, want to see the most positive thing come from this as possible

- Like to see something good happen for the community and the county
- Question is “how do we get there?”

Commissioner Walker questioned Manager Morris what his recommendation/pros/cons would be toward the County taking ownership of the property.

County Manager Morris responded:

- Not sure at this point what the pros/cons would be
- Have offered to the Board of Commissioners, if you decide to take ownership, form a TaskForce to include county staff to work with the community for a specific period of time
- Would assume if you take ownership, would set guidelines upfront
- Will work with the community to give them every opportunity to come up with a solution that the Board of Commissioners would be happy with

Commissioner Walker continued:

- Like the sound of Manager Morris’ proposal
- Have felt that the manager has put a lot time and thought into this possible transfer
- Appreciate his proposal and offer

Vice Chairman Booth commented:

- Know the Board of Education and the community are ready for a decision
- Feel the community is underway doing their due diligence
- If this Board decides to take ownership, there definitely has to be a time period set upfront
- At the end of the specific time, if the solution is not self-sustainable or feasible and the community can’t take ownership, the County will then have to decide what is the next step
- Will need to make sure everyone understands upfront what the timeframe and expectations are from the County

Commissioner Lankford commented:

- Want what is best for the community
- Need to use the facility if there is any way possible
- This Board must be clear upfront what our objectives are
- If ownership is transferred to the community, the community has to understand that maintenance and upkeep of the building will be the community’s responsibility
- The plan must be sustainable
- Agree with Vice Chairman Booth, there has to be a timeframe set upfront
- The community must understand at the end of the timeframe, if the community does not have a sustainable plan, the Board of Commissioners will decide what to do with the facility
- Has to be a clear message to the community
- Has to be a clear understanding between the County and the community



- The community can't assume the County will take over the facility and continue to keep up the facility if no sustainable plan is developed by the end of the timeframe
- Facility can be used for a lot different things
- Hope there can be a recommendation to the Board within a reasonable time
- If this Board takes ownership, this Board needs to be specific regarding the timeframe and a clear understanding of what the results have to be at the end of the timeframe
- Done some research regarding costs to maintain the facility at the present time:
  - Will cost approximately \$17,620 per year
    - Does not include mowing the grounds
    - Includes electricity, alarm system, wastewater quarterly checks and insurance
    - Insurance and electricity (\$1,270 per month) are based on an average
- County will incur these costs per year if ownership is taken by the County

Vice Chairman Booth commented:

- Appreciate the information regarding annual maintenance costs from Commissioner Lankford
- Have been told that so far this year, expenses are approximately \$30,000
- The \$17,620 sounds more of a reasonable amount
- Feel one year would be ample time to determine if there is a sustainable and feasible plan
- It is too good of a facility to be torn down
- The older part has a metal roof and new heating/air system
- Hope the community can come up with a feasible and self-sustainable plan for using the facility

Commissioner Lankford continued:

- The facility can be used for educational purposes and will not have to have a new septic permit which will accommodate 200 students
- Reiterated the information provided by Manager Morris that currently the existing drainfield is smaller than what is required for a 3-bedroom house
- All items will have to be brought up to code
- Want to make sure those here today understand what will be needed if not used for educational purposes

Commissioner Jones commented:

- Agree that all this information needs to be provided to the community so that everyone understands what barriers there are to use the facility other than for educational purposes
- Bringing this facility up to code is going to be a fiscal challenge that may be huge
- Want to reiterate that this information needs to get out in the community

Commissioner Walker commented:

- During my visit to the facility, Mr. Horace Stimson was there and was provided this information about the septic

- Hope Mr. Stimson will provide his community this information at their upcoming meeting on the 15<sup>th</sup>
- Heard Mr. Stimson state during public comments that one of the steps the committee is going to take is to get their own set of numbers, get their own actual factual information
- Commend the work being done by the committee and the community
- Feel the committee is being very practical and very realistic on how they are approaching this
- My perspective, being one of five commissioners, will be to make decisions to help in any way within reason that we can
- If we start bumping into obstacles, there may have to be a time to regroup
- Also appreciate the information provided by Commissioner Lankford, had also heard an estimate of approximately \$30,000 being spent on the facility since it was closed

Commissioner Lankford commented:

- Someone will have to mow the grounds
- The estimate I presented includes electrical being an average of \$15,240 per year; the alarm system being \$180 per year; the wastewater system being \$800 per year; the insurance being an average of \$1,400 per year
- Feel the \$30,000 may have included some things that the school system had to do in closing the facility such as winterization
- That \$17,620 has already been paid for by the school system

County Manager Morris commented:

- There is one unknown with those estimates and that is the cost for the insurance
- Our NCACC Insurance Pool will cover the facility until June 30, 2016
- They have already told staff that after June 30<sup>th</sup>, the county will have to seek insurance through a third party carrier
- Have no idea what that cost will be

Chairman Inman recognized Board of Education Member Bill Hart.

Member Hart commented:

- Just want to let the Board know that Manager Morris arranged a meeting with some of the committee members and the county inspectors
- That information regarding the septic was provided at the meeting and has been provided to the community

Mr. Stimson commented from the audience:

- Appreciate the information provided by Commissioner Lankford
- Agree there needs to be a clear understanding of a timeframe and what is expected
- The committee wants to develop a plan that will work

Vice Chairman Booth commented:

- At the meeting, Mr. Stimson had stated the community would be willing to mow the grounds

Mr. Melvin George commented from the audience:

- Complained that a superintendent had told members of the community years ago that there were no plans in closing the school and that the school would be taken care of
- Feel the plan all along was to close Francisco Elementary School

Chairman Inman noted that this was not relevant to the agenda item today and deals with the Board of Education and not the Board of County Commissioners.

The Board of Commissioners continued their discussion.

Commissioner Lankford commented:

- Reiterated that the facility could be used for educational purposes such as a private school, a religious school or anything related to schools

Vice Chairman Booth commented:

- Would be good to know if it could be used for adult classes

Chairman Inman commented:

- Reiterated the Agenda item today is to decide if the Board of County Commissioners will take ownership from the Board of Education of Francisco Elementary School
- Can assure everyone that this Board will not make a hasty decision
- Noticed there was a message on the fire department's board regarding the Commissioners taking 6 months to do due diligence
- Would hope the community would rather the Board take 6 months to do due diligence and not make a 6-minute decision that was not in the best interest of this community
- If the county takes ownership, we can then come to the community to work together to figure what is in the best interest of this community
- We have been listening and will continue to listen
- The fact that we don't comment during Public Comments does not mean that we are not listening
- Questioned where the Board wishes to go from here?

The Board agreed to place the item on the Action Agenda for the next meeting.

Chairman Inman, with full consent of the Board, directed the Clerk to place the item on the February 22<sup>nd</sup> Action Agenda.

**Proposed Amendments – An Ordinance Creating a Stokes County Animal Control Department Prescribing the Duties of the Department, Regulations, Regarding Animals and Providing for the Enforcement of Said Regulations**

County Manager Rick Morris presented the following proposed amended Animal Control

Ordinance for the Board's consideration: (items are underlined that have been changed)

## STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

### AN ORDINANCE CREATING A STOKES COUNTY ANIMAL CONTROL DEPARTMENT, PRESCRIBING THE DUTIES OF THE DEPARTMENT, REGULATIONS REGARDING ANIMAL, AND PROVIDING FOR THE ENFORCEMENT OF COUNTY OF STOKES SAID REGULATIONS

#### ARTICLE I. GERERAL

##### Section 1. Definitions.

As used in this ordinance, the following words mean:

**Adequate Shelter for Dogs:** A structure intended for the animal's protection from inclement weather or sun, which consist of at least three sides, a floor and a roof. The structure must be constructed of durable fiber, wood, plastic or other non-metal material.

**Animal Control Officer:** The person designated by the Stokes County Board of Commissioners to enforce this Ordinance and carry out such other duties with respect to Animal Control as may be designated by the Board.

**Animal Shelter:** Any premises designated by the County for the purpose of impounding and caring for all animals found running at large or otherwise subject to impounding in accordance with provisions of this ordinance.

**At Large:** Any animal shall be deemed to be at large when he is off the property of his owner and not under the control of a competent person.

**Exposed to Rabies:** An animal has been exposed to rabies within the meaning of this ordinance, if it has been bitten by, or exposed to, any animal known or suspected to have been infected with rabies.

**Dangerous Dog:** A dog that:

- a) Without provocation has killed or inflicted severe injury on a person; or
- b) Is determined by the Animal Control Officer to be potentially dangerous because the dog has engaged in one or more of the behaviors listed under "Potentially Dangerous Dog".
- c) Is owned or harbored primarily or in part for the purpose of dog fighting, or any dog trained for dog fighting.

**Kennel, Dealer, Breeder or Pet Shop:** Any person, group of persons, partnership or corporation engaged in buying, selling, breeding, or boarding pet animals.

**Neutered Male:** Any male which has been operated upon to prevent reproduction.

**Nuisance:** Any animal is deemed a public nuisance and a threat to public health, safety, welfare, and tranquility if it repeatedly:

- a) Chases pedestrians, bicycles, animals, or motorized vehicles; or
- b) Snaps at people; or
- c) Roams in packs; or
- d) Fights with other animals; or
- e) Barks or howls; or
- f) Destroys or defaces lawns, shrubs, trees, agricultural crops, or other property; or
- g) Scatters garbage out of cans or other containers; or
- h) Takes personal property from where it belongs; or
- i) Creates a nuisance in any other way

**Owner:** Any person, group of persons, firm, partnership or corporation owning, keeping, having charge of, sheltering, feeding, harboring or taking care of any animal. The owner is responsible for the care, actions and behavior of his animals.

**Potentially Dangerous Dog:** a dog that the Animal Control Officer determines to have:

- a) Inflicted a bite on a person that resulted in broken bones or disfiguring lacerations or required cosmetic surgery or hospitalization; or
- b) Killed or inflicted severe injury upon a domestic animal when not on the owner's real property; or
- c) Approached a person when not on the owner's property in a vicious or terrorizing manner in an apparent attitude of attack.

**Restraint:** Any animal is under restraint within the meaning of this ordinance if it is controlled by means of a chain, leash or like device; or is within a secure enclosure.

**Restraint of a dangerous or potentially dangerous dog:** Confinement in a securely enclosed pen or other structure having a roof, cement floor, and secured by a padlock. When this type of dog is outside this pen or structure, it must be restrained and held by the owner, or one who is in direct control, by an adequate leash, chain or other like device and the dog must be muzzled at all times. At no time shall restraint of this type of dog be accomplished by chaining it outside the pen or structure.

**Spayed Female:** Any female which has been operated upon to prevent conception.

**Vicious Animal:** An animal that has made an unprovoked attack on a human by biting or in any manner causing abrasions or cuts of the skin; or one which habitually or repeatedly attacks farm stock and other pets.

## **Section 2. Establishment and Composition of an Animal Control Department, Appointment, and Compensation of Department Employees**

There is hereby created an Animal Control Department of the county, which shall be composed of such employees as shall be determined by the Board of County Commissioners. Such employees

shall be hired and compensated in accordance with the policies of the County of Stokes Personnel Policies Handbook.

### **Section 3. General Duties of Animal Control Department**

The Animal Control Department shall be charged with the responsibility of:

- a) Enforcing in this county, all state and county laws and ordinances relating to the care, custody, and control of animals
- b) Cooperating with the Health Director and assisting in the enforcement of laws of the state with regard to animals and especially with regard to vaccination of dogs and cats against rabies and the confinement or leashing of vicious animals
- c) Investigating cruelty or animal abuse with regard to all animals.
- d) Making such canvasses of the county, including the homes in the county, as it deems necessary for the purpose of ascertaining that all dogs are duly and properly listed for tax purposes, and that all dogs and cats are vaccinated against rabies
- e) Operating the Animal Control Shelter pursuant to policies of the Board of County Commissioners and the State of North Carolina.

### **Section 4. Records to be kept by the Animal Control Department**

It shall be the duty of the Animal Control Department to keep or cause to be kept, accurate and detailed records of:

- a) Impoundment and disposition of all animals coming into animal shelter
- b) Bite cases, violations and complaints, and investigation of same.
- c) All monies belonging to the county which were derived from impoundment fees, penalties, and sales of animals.
- d) All other records deemed necessary by the county manager.

### **Section 5. Animal Control Advisory Council**

There is hereby created an Animal Control Advisory Council to advise the Board of County Commissioners and the county manager with respect to animal control matters. The Animal Control Advisory Council shall be composed of members appointed by the Board of County Commissioners to serve at the pleasure of the Board.

### **Section 6. General Duties of Keepers of Animals**

It shall be unlawful for any person to keep animals under unsanitary or inhuman conditions or to fail to provide proper food and water daily, shelter from weather and reasonably clean quarters for such animals, or to fail to provide proper medical, attention for sick, distressed, or injured animals, as well as adequate inoculation against disease, according to the species of animals kept.

#### **Section 6.1 Adequate Shelter for Dogs**

Owners of dogs shall provide a structure intended for the animal's protection from inclement weather or sun, which consist of at least three sides, a floor and a roof. The structure must be constructed of durable fiber, wood, plastic or other non-metal material.

### **Section 7. Cruelty to Animals**

It shall be unlawful for any person to molest, torture, torment, deprive of necessary sustenance, cruelly beat, needlessly mutilate or kill, wound, injure, poison, abandon or subject to conditions

detrimental to its health or general welfare of any animal, or to cause or procure such action. The words "torture" and "torment" shall be held to include every act, omission or neglect whereby unjustifiable physical pain, suffering or death is caused or permitted; but such terms shall not be constructed to prohibit lawful shooting of birds, deer, or other game for humane food; nor to prohibit to animal control department or its agents or veterinarians from destroying dangerous, unwanted or injured animals in a humane manner.

#### **Section 8. Confinement, Muzzle, and Control of Vicious or Dangerous Dogs or Animals**

It shall be unlawful for any owner to keep any vicious, fierce, dangerous, or potentially dangerous dog or animal within the county, unless it is confined within a secure building, pen or enclosure as defined in this Ordinance, or unless it is securely muzzled and under restraint by a competent person who, by means of a leash, chain or rope, has such animal firmly under control at all times.

Violators of this section shall be guilty of a Class Three (3) Misdemeanor under N.C.G.S. 14-49(a) and shall be fined not more than \$500 per violation.

#### **Section 9. Animals Creating Nuisance Subject to Specific Security Measures**

- a) If an animal is reported to an Animal Control Officer as being a nuisance, the Animal Control Officer shall investigate to determine whether the animal in question falls within the definition of Nuisance in Section 1.

If the Animal Control Officer finds that the animal is a Nuisance, the Animal Control Officer shall order the animal to be secured and subject to the following specific security measures:

- b) Specific Security Measures Required:

- 1) While the animal is outside unsupervised, the animal must be secure on the owner's property in a 10 ft. x 10 ft. kennel with a solid floor and solid roof with padlock on kennel door; or a tether that is appropriate for the dog's size, weight, and age in an area free of debris that could cause the dog to get tangled. While outside the animal still must be in compliance with all county and North Carolina State Laws regarding proper housing and life sustaining substances.
- 2) While the animal is outside being supervised, the animal may be on a non-retractable leash controlled by someone at least 18 years of age who has full control of the animal at all times.
- 3) Animal must be current on Rabies Vaccinations at all times as outlined in North Carolina General Statute 130A-185. A vaccination – the owner of a cat, dog, or ferret over 4 months of age shall have the animal vaccinated against rabies.
- 4) The animal's owner may not sell, give away or in any way move the animal from the location where the animal lives without 24 hours prior notification to the Stokes County Animal Control Department.

- c) In addition to criminal penalties, any person violating the order set forth in subsection (a) above shall be subject to the following civil penalties:

- 1) First Offense – Written Warning
- 2) Second Offense - \$100 civil penalty
- 3) Third Offense - \$200 civil penalty

- 4) Fourth Offense - \$300 civil penalty
- 5) Fifth Offense - \$400 civil penalty
- 6) Sixth Offense and subsequent offense - \$500 civil penalty and seizure of the animal
- d) The animal's owner shall comply with the ORDER no later than the due date specified by implementing the specified security measures which must be approved by Stokes County Animal Control Department unless a written appeal is filed within three (3) days of service of the order with the Stokes County Manager at the Stokes County Administrative Building, 1014 Main Street, Danbury, NC 27016.

#### **Section 10. Dog Privilege Tax Tag**

- a) It is the purpose of this Section to supplement State Law by providing a procedure for the enforcement of laws and requiring dogs to wear a privilege tax tag
- b) It shall be unlawful for any dog owner or keeper to fail to provide his dog with a dog privilege tax tag to be issued annually by Stokes County and to take such action as is necessary to insure that said privilege tax tag is worn by said dog at all times except as otherwise provided in this ordinance.
- c) It shall be the duty of the Stokes County Tax Department to provide the animal shelter with a privilege tax list so that tags may be mailed. The tag is to contain a number or other designation, and a record is to be kept of the person whom the tag has been mailed or otherwise deferred. After the initial mailing by September 1, dog tags may be obtained at the animal shelter only.
- d) In addition to all other penalties prescribed by law, a dog is subject to impoundment in accordance with the provisions of this ordinance if the dog is found not to be wearing a currently valid dog privilege tax tag. Provided, however, that the provisions of this section shall not apply to any dog being kept in any governmental facility, veterinary hospital, or licenses commercial animal establishment.
- e) It shall also be unlawful for any individual moving into Stokes County who was or keeps a dog to fail to obtain a valid rabies tag and dog privilege tax tag within (30) days of moving into the County.
- f) The fee for the privilege tax tag shall be six dollars (\$6.00) per animal. In the event the tag is lost or stolen, a replacement tag can be obtained at the animal shelter for six dollars (\$6.00) per animal.

#### **Section 11. Exemptions from Ordinance**

Hospitals, clinics, and other premises operated by licensed veterinarians for the care and treatment of animals and exempt from of the provisions of this ordinance, except Sections 6,7,8,9.

#### **Section 12: Interference with Enforcement of Ordinance**

It shall be unlawful for any person to interfere with, hinder or molest the animal control department or its agents or animal control officers or veterinarians in the performance of any duty authorized by this ordinance, or to seek to release any animal in the custody of such agents, except as otherwise specifically provided.



## **ARTICLE II. RABIES CONTROL**

### **Section 13. Compliance with State Law; Article as Supplement to State Law**

- a) It shall be unlawful for any dog, cat, or ferret owner to fail to comply with the state laws relating to the control of rabies. A civil penalty for non-compliance of one hundred (\$100) shall be imposed if owner does not comply within 10 working days of written warning.
- b) It is the purpose of this article to supplement that state laws by providing a procedure for the enforcement of state laws relating to rabies control, in addition to the criminal penalties provided by state law.

### **Section 14. Inoculation of Dogs, Cats and other Animals**

- a) It shall be unlawful for an owner to fail to provide current inoculation against rabies (hydrophobia) for any dog or cat four (4) months of age or older. Should it be deemed necessary by the County Health Director or the State Public Health Veterinarian that other pets be inoculated in order to prevent a threatened epidemic or to control an existing epidemic, it shall be unlawful for an owner to fail to provide current inoculation against rabies for that animal.
- b) A dog, cat, or ferret that has not been previously vaccinated against rabies is considered "currently vaccinated" against rabies 28 days after the date of the initial, or primary, rabies vaccination.

### **Section 15. Inoculation Tag for Dogs**

- a) Upon complying with the provisions of Section 14, there shall be issued to the owner of the dog inoculated a numbered metallic tag, stamped with the number and the year for which issued, and indicating that the dog has been inoculated against rabies.
- b) It shall be unlawful for any dog owner to fail to provide his dog with a collar or harness to which a current tag issued under this section is secure attached. The collar or harness, with attached tag, must be worn at all times, except during the time the dog is performing at shows, obedience trials, tracking tests, field trails, training schools or other events sanctioned and supervised by a recognized organization.
- c) It shall be unlawful for any person to use for any dog a rabies inoculation tag issued for a dog other than the one using the tag.

### **Section 15.1 Evidence of Inoculation of Cats and Ferrets**

Cats and Ferrets shall not be required to wear the metallic tag referred to in Section 15, but the owner of the cat or ferret shall maintain sufficient written evidence to prove that his/her cat or ferret has a current rabies inoculation

### **Section 16. Reports and Confinement of Animals Biting Persons or Showing Symptoms of Rabies.**

- a) Every animal which has bitten any person or which shows symptoms of rabies shall be confined immediately and shall be promptly reported to the animal control department, and thereupon shall be securely quarantined, at the direction of the animal control department,

for a period of ten (10) days, and shall not be released from such quarantine except by written permission from the animal control department.

- b) Animals quarantined under this section shall be confined in a veterinary hospital or at the county animal shelter, at the expense of the owner; provided, however, that if any animal control officer determines that the owner of an animal which must be quarantined has adequate confinement facilities upon his own premises, the animal control officer shall authorize the animal to be confined on the owner's premises, the animal control officer shall revisit the premises for inspection purpose at approximately the middle of the confinement period and again at the conclusion of the confinement period.
- c) In the case of stray animals whose ownership is not known, the supervised quarantine required by this section shall be at the county animal shelter.
- d) If rabies does not develop within ten (10) days after an animal is quarantined under this section, the animal may be released from quarantine with the written permission of the animal control department. If the animal has been confined in the county animal shelter, the owner shall pay the sum equal to ten dollars (\$10.00) for each day of confinement to defray the cost of feeding, upon reclaiming the animal.

#### **Section 17. Destruction or Confinement of Animal Bitten by Rabid Animal**

In accordance with General Statue 130A-197 when the local health director reasonably suspects that an animal required to be vaccinated under this Ordinance has been exposed to the saliva or tissue of a rabid animal or animal reasonably suspected of having rabies, the animal shall be considered to have been exposed to rabies. An animal exposed to rabies shall be destroyed immediately by its owner, the county Animal Control Officer or a peace officer unless the animal has been vaccinated against rabies in accordance with this Ordinance more than 28 days prior to being exposed, and has been given a booster dose of rabies vaccine within five days of the exposure. As an alternative to destruction, the animal may be quarantined at a facility approved by the local health director for a period up to six months, and under reasonable conditions imposed by the local health director.

#### **Section 18. Area-wide Emergency Quarantine**

- a) When reports indicate a positive diagnosis of rabies, the county director of public health shall order an area-wide quarantine for such period as it deems necessary. Upon invoking of such emergency quarantine, no animal shall be taken into the streets permitted to be in the streets during such period. During such quarantine, no animal may be taken or shipped from the county without permission of the animal control department, each member of the animal control department and the police and sheriff's department hereby fully authorized, during such emergency, to impound any animal found running at large in the county. During the quarantine period, the animal control department or the local health authorities shall be empowered to provide for a program of mass immunization by the establishment of temporary emergency rabies vaccination facilities strategically located throughout the county.
- b) In the event, there are additional positive cases of rabies occurring during the period of quarantine, such period of quarantine may be extended at the discretion of the county director of public health.

### **Section 19. Postmortem Diagnosis**

- a) If an animal dies while under observation of rabies, the head of such animal shall be submitted to the state laboratory in Raleigh for diagnosis.
- b) The carcass of any dead animal exposed to rabies shall be surrendered to the Animal Control Department. The head of such animal shall be submitted to the state laboratory in Raleigh for diagnosis.

### **Section 20. Unlawful Killing or Releasing of Certain Animals.**

It shall be unlawful for any person to kill or release any animal under observation for rabies, any animal suspected of having been exposed to rabies, or any animal biting human, or to remove such animal from the county without written permission from the animal control department and the county director of public health.

### **Section 21. Failure to Surrender Animal for Quarantine or Destruction**

It shall be unlawful for any person to fail or refuse to surrender any animal for quarantine or destruction as required in this article, when demand is made therefore by the animal control department.

## **ARTICLE III. IMPOUNDMENT**

### **Section 22. General Provisions**

- a) Any animal which appears to be lost, strayed or unwanted, or which is found to be not wearing a currently valid rabies vaccination tag, as required by state law or this ordinance, or which is found at large or not under restraint in violation of this ordinance shall be impounded by the animal control department and confined in the animal shelter in a humane manner. Impoundment of such an animal shall not relieve the owner thereof from any penalty which may be imposed for violation of this ordinance.
- b) It shall be unlawful for any owner or his agent to permit a female animal to run at large or be tethered or kept where more animals can breed during estrus. Any such animal must be kept in an enclosure that cannot be breached or have accessible openings of 1" or more or be, at all times, under restraint or direct control of the owner or agent.
- c) Any person violating the order set forth in subsection (b) above shall be subject to the following civil penalties:
  - 1) First Offense – Written Warning
  - 2) Second Offense - \$100 civil penalty
  - 3) Third Offense - \$200 civil penalty
  - 4) Fourth Offense - \$300 civil penalty
  - 5) Fifth Offence - \$400 civil penalty
  - 6) Sixth Offense and subsequent offense - \$500 civil penalty and seizure of the animal

### **Section 23. Notice to Owner**

Immediately upon impounding an animal, the animal control department shall make reasonable effort to notify the owner and inform such owner of the conditions whereby the animal may be redeemed. If the owner is unknown, notice of such impoundment shall be posted for 72 hours, or

until the animal is disposed of, on a bulletin board at the animal shelter, and the time and place of the taking of such animal, together with the time and date of posting the notice shall be stated therein.

## **ARTICLE IV. FEES**

### **Section 24. Redemption by Owner**

The owner of an animal impounded under this article may redeem the animal and regain possession thereof within seventy two (72) hours (three days) after notice of impoundment is given or posted, as required by Section 23, by complying with all applicable provisions of this ordinance and paying a redemption fee of twenty five dollars (\$25.00) plus a boarding fee of ten dollars (\$10.00) for each day the animal is held at the animal shelter. Valid proof of ownership is required for redemption of animal. Examples of valid proof of ownership could be but not limited to current rabies vaccination certificates, vet records, current county tax tag, or receipt of purchase. The owner of an animal impounded and not redeemed within the required holding period shall be responsible for the fees incurred, whether or not the animal is claimed.

Redemption Fee	\$25.00
Boarding Fee	\$10.00
Rabies vaccination	\$10.00
Tags	\$6.00

### **Section 24-1. Kennel Permits**

Any individual who operates a breeding kennel that has five (5) or more female breeding dogs must acquire breeding permit from Animal Control Department. The fee for this breeding permit is sixty dollars (\$60.00) per year. The permit allows inspection by animal control Monday-Friday (8:30 am to 5:00 pm).

### **Section 25. Destruction or Adoption of Unredeemed Animals**

- a) If an impounded animal is not redeemed by the owner within the period prescribed in Section 24, it may be destroyed in a humane manner or offered for adoption by any reasonable adult who is willing to comply with this ordinance. Such animal may be adopted by the first person who pays an adoption fee of one hundred dollars (\$100.00) for dogs and sixty dollars (\$60.00) for cats for Stokes County residents. Non Stokes County residents pay ninety four dollars (\$94.00) for the adoption of dogs. No tag required for cats or out of county dogs. The services included in adoption for dogs are as follows:

1. Spay or neuter
2. Heart worm test
3. Rabies shot or voucher
4. County tax tag
5. Parasite treatment
6. First dhpp shot

The services included in adoption for cats are as follows:

1. Spay or neuter

- |                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| 2. Rabies shot or voucher     | \$60.00                                |
| <hr/>                         |  |
| 3. FIV & Feline leukemia test |  |
| 4. FVRCP & leukemia shots     |  |
| 5. Parasite treatment         | \$100.00 if all services are preformed |

- b) Any person that elects to surrender an animal that they have had in their custody and care for at least 72 hours (3 days) to the animal shelter, shall pay a fee of forty dollars (\$40.00).  
Also, any person that elects to surrender a litter of puppies or kittens shall pay a fee of forty dollars (\$40.00) and will receive a forty dollar (\$40.00) voucher towards the spay or neuter of an animal.
- c) No dog owner may be permitted to adopt his own dog under the provisions of this section, but he must comply with the provisions of Section 24, in order to reclaim a dog that has been impounded pursuant to state law or this article.
- d) No animal which has been impounded by reason of being a stray, unclaimed by its owner, shall be allowed to be adopted from the animal shelter during a period of emergency rabies quarantine invoked pursuant to Section 18, except by special authorization of the public health officials.

#### **Section 26. Procedure with Respect to Redemption or Adoption of Unvaccinated Animals**

- a) Unless proof of a current rabies vaccination can be furnished, every person who either adopts or redeems an animal at the animal shelter shall be given a "proof of rabies vaccination card" at the time of the redemption or adoption. This card shall be stamped with the date stating the maximum time limit allowed to take the animal to the veterinarian of such person's choice for rabies vaccination. The time limit for dogs and cats four (4) months and older will be forty eight (48) hours, with Sundays and Holidays excluded. For puppies and kittens under four (4) months, the time limit will vary according to their age.
- b) The proof of rabies vaccination card will be completed and returned to the animal shelter by the veterinarian. If this card is not returned to the animal shelter within the time specified on the card, an animal control officer will be dispatched to retrieve the dog or cat.
- c) Payment for the rabies vaccination provided for in this section will be the responsibility of the person redeeming or adopting the dog or cat.
- d) The adoption fee includes rabies vaccine or voucher.

#### **Section 27. Suspected Rabid Animals Not to be Redeemed or Adopted**

Notwithstanding any other provision of this article, animal impounded which appear to be suffering from rabies shall not be redeemed or adopted, but shall be dealt with in accordance with Article II of this Ordinance.

#### **Section 28. Destruction of Wounded or Diseased Animals**

- a) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this article, any animal impounded which is badly wounded or diseased (not a rabies suspect) and has no identification shall be destroyed immediately in a humane manner. If the animal has identification, the animal control department shall attempt to notify the owner before disposing of such animal, but if the

owner cannot be reached readily, and the animal is suffering, the animal control department may destroy the animal at its discretion in a humane manner.

- b) If an animal is determined by the animal control officer or any law enforcement officer to pose an immediate danger to the health and safety of any person, the animal may be destroyed on-site with or without prior notification to the owner if all other means of capture have been unsuccessful, or if trying to capture the animal would put the officer in a dangerous situation.
- c) If the animal control officer and/or law enforcement officer does destroy an animal on site, he/she shall submit a written report of the incident to the Chief Animal Control Officer within twenty four (24) hours (weekends and holidays excluded) of the incident and shall make a good faith attempt to notify the owner of the destroyed animal. The Chief Animal Control Officer will review the incident with the County Manager.

### **Section 29. Penalties**

- a) Criminal Penalties – Persons violating this ordinance shall be guilty of a Class Three (3) Misdemeanor and shall be fined not more than Five Hundred Dollars (\$500). Each day of a violation shall constitute a separate offense. The payment of a fine imposed in criminal proceedings does not relieve the person of liability for any taxes, fees, costs or civil penalties otherwise imposed by this ordinance.
- b) Civil Penalties – In addition to criminal penalties, persons who violate this ordinance shall be subject to civil penalties for each violation in the amount established by this Ordinance. Each day of a violation shall constitute a separate offense.
- c) Citations – The Animal Control Officer is authorized to issue criminal and civil citations to violators of this ordinance. All civil penalties must be paid within 72 hours. No impounded animal may be redeemed until all civil penalties, fees and costs are paid in full.
- d) Civil Action – Civil penalties may be recovered against violators in a civil action by the County. In addition to the civil penalties, the County may recover court costs including reasonable attorney fees incurred by the County.
- e) Equitable Remedies – Enforcement of this ordinance may also be by appropriate equitable remedy, injunction or order of abatement issued by the District Court of Stokes County.

### **Section 30. Severability**

If any section or part of this ordinance should be held invalid for any reason, such determination shall not affect the remaining sections or parts, and to that end the provisions of this ordinance are severable.

### **Section 31. Effective Date**

This ordinance shall become effective May 1, 1975 as adopted by the Stokes County Board of Commissioners on April 7, 1975 and readopted on September 12, 1977, and amended on December 16, 1985; December 21, 1987; February 7, 1994; June 21, 2001; July 1, 2004; May 24, 2010; June 27, 2012; February 9, 2015; and December 28, 2015.

---

**J. Leon Inman, Chairman**  
**Stokes County Board of Commissioners**

ATTESTED BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
**Darlene M. Bullins**  
**Clerk to the Board**

County Manager Morris presented the following comments:

- Have two ordinances to work on today regarding animal control in Stokes County
- There have been a lot changes within the past few months regarding animal control
- Chief Animal Officer Kevin Webster and his staff have been reviewing policies, state regulations, and protocols
- Chief Animal Control Officer Webster has done an outstanding job to make sure that the County's ordinances include what is needed to make sure regulations are up-to-date and to make sure current laws are enforceable
- The first ordinance is the regular Animal Control Ordinance with the Exotic Animal Ordinance to follow
- County Attorney Ty Browder has reviewed and approved both ordinances
- Chief Animal Control Officer Kevin Webster has included what is needed in the amended Animal Control Ordinance for your review and approval
- Chief Animal Control Officer Kevin Webster is in attendance for the meeting to answer any questions
- Would request the amended Animal Control Ordinance be moved to today's Action Agenda in order to allow the County's Animal Control Officers to be able to enforce those changes

Chairman Inman opened the floor for discussion.

Commissioner Lankford commented:

- Questioned the definition of a "dangerous dog" and what can be done with a dog that continues to come on the landowner's property and destroy property?
- Most dogs that continue to come on another person's property normally don't have a collar or owner information
- A landowner has no idea if the dogs have rabies or are potentially dangerous
- Also questioned why this type of behavior would not be considered a dangerous dog?

Chief Animal Control Officer Webster responded:

- Feel the situation that Commissioner Lankford is describing would be a nuisance animal and not a dangerous animal

Commissioner Lankford continued:

- I am talking with experience, I have a situation where a dog continues to come on my property and do not know if the dog is dangerous
- Need to have this type of dog in some type of category
- Property owner needs to be able to call someone regarding this type of situation

Chief Animal Control Officer Webster responded:

- In that situation, you can call Animal Control as related in Section 9 – “Animals Creating Nuisance Subject to Specific Security Measures”
- There is no way know if the animal is dangerous until it is encountered
- Animal Control can help to determine that

County Manager Morris commented:

- In most cases the animal would be picked up, but the determining factor is whether the shelter can handle the animal
- We can't overload the shelter and be out of compliance with the State

Commissioner Lankford questioned what happens if the dog does not have a collar or does not have any owner information listed?

Chief Animal Control Officer Webster responded:

- If the animal can be taken to the shelter, it comes in for a three-day hold stray period which gives the owner the opportunity to locate his/her animal
- Will be happy to assist any property owner with this kind of situation

Vice Chairman Booth commented:

- Questioned what happens if there is no room at the shelter?

Chief Animal Control Officer Webster responded:

- Would do the best we can do to correct situation until the animal could be placed at the shelter

Vice Chairman Booth continued:

- Confirmed with Animal Control Officer Webster that after the three-day waiting period, the animal can be put up for adoption or dispersed as deemed fit
- Confirmed with Animal Control Officer Webster that the Animal Control Staff will try to do everything possible to get the animal adopted

Commissioner Jones commented:

- Every time it is amended, it just keeps getting better
- Biggest challenge is educating the public regarding the rules and regulations

Chief Animal Control Officer Webster responded:

- Agree with Commissioner Jones that education is a big factor
- Will place the adopted ordinance on the Animal Control Website and the County Website

Commissioner Jones commented:

- Posted it on Facebook the last time it was amended

Chief Animal Control Officer Webster responded:

- Can look at putting it on Facebook



Commissioner Walker commented:

- Agree with Commissioner Lankford that no one knows whether a dog is dangerous or not
- Confirmed with Chief Animal Control Officer Webster that this amended ordinance is what is needed to regulate and enforce the rules
- Confirmed with Chief Animal Control Officer Webster that Animal Control can assist in trapping an animal that continues to be a nuisance
- Confirmed with Chief Animal Control Officer Webster that one of the amendments will require a property owner, if their animal is declared a nuisance, to be secured on the owner's property in a 10 ft. x 10 ft. kennel with a solid floor and roof with a padlock on kennel door
- Not sure if everyone who owns an animal has that kind of kennel
- Some property owners may have a 100 ft. x 100 ft. area or backyard that can be deemed secure
- Could there be some language added that a property owner can have a secured location

Chief Animal Control Officer Webster responded:

- In some cases, a kennel is needed for animals that can dig out or climb out
- Have no problem with adding those conditions (secured location) to the ordinance

County Attorney Ty Browder suggested adding the following:

- Or other enclosure approved by the Animal Control Officer (after the padlock on kennel door)

Chief Animal Control Officer Webster responded:

- Have no issues with the wording suggested by County Attorney Browder

The Board discussed the 10 ft. x 10 ft. kennel versus a secured location.

The Board had no issues with the wording suggested by County Attorney Browder.

Commissioner Walker continued:

- There is a pretty strong movement regarding "tethering" an animal
- Feel that needs to be monitored

Chief Animal Control Officer Webster responded:

- Tethering of an animal can be a temporary solution
- Have discussed the use of tethering with other counties, very hard to enforce
- Will continue to monitor the movement regarding "tethering"

Commissioner Walker continued:

- Confirmed with Chief Animal Control Officer Webster that an animal being declared as a nuisance must be supervised and on a leash even if it is a normally well behaved animal

- Like the changes, but feel anytime an ordinance is amended, the changes should be monitored to make sure we are on target and see if there needs to be any fine tuning
- Feel the ordinance is moving on the right track
- Support the changes

Vice Chairman Booth commented:

- Confirmed with Chief Animal Control Officer Webster that officers try to work with the animal's owner pertaining to each individual case
- Confirmed with Chief Animal Control Officer Webster that changes in the ordinance will allow staff to determine if the animal is a nuisance or a dangerous dog

Chief Animal Control Officer Webster added that when Animal Control receives a call regarding an animal being a nuisance, the animal owner is first given a warning unless it is a serious situation.

County Manager Morris commented:

- Reiterated that there was a sense of urgency in approving both ordinances today
- Animal Control Officers are dealing with situations that apply to both ordinances
- Would like to give the officers the ability to their job

Commissioner Jones commented:

- Thinking about what perception these ordinances might have regarding the animal rights groups when talking about tethering or deemed appropriate

County Manager Morris responded:

- Do not feel there will be any issues
- Feel these groups like to know what can be done and what is being done
- Dr. Debbie Cowan, County's Veterinarian, has reviewed both ordinances with no issues

Commissioner Walker requested approval from Chairman Inman to ask King City Manager Homer Dearmin and Chief of Police Paula May their thoughts on the proposed changes.

Chairman Inman questioned City King Manager Dearmin and Chief of Police Paula May if they had any comments?

City Manager Dearmin stated he had no concerns regarding the amended Animal Control Ordinance being discussed.

Chief of Police Paula May stated without having a copy of the changes, felt it would be

inappropriate to comment at this time and that there were no outstanding issues involving the County's Animal Control Ordinance.

Commissioner Walker requested Chief of Police May review the ordinance and get back with the County if there were any concerns.

Vice Chairman Booth confirmed with Chief Animal Control Officer Webster that the wording suggested by County Attorney Browder would work.

The Board agreed to move the item as amended by County Attorney Browder to today's Action Agenda.

Chairman Inman, with full consent of the Board, directed the Clerk to place the item on today's Action Agenda.

### **Revised County Exotic Animal Ordinance**

County Manager Rick Morris presented the following revised County Exotic Animal Ordinance for the Board's consideration that included additional changes by County Attorney Ty Browder from the one provided in the Board's Agenda packet: (items underlined were changes made after the Agenda packets were delivered to the Board)

## **STOKES COUNTY EXOTIC ANIMAL ORDINANCE**

### **SECTION 1. LEGAL AUTHORITY AND INTENT**

This Ordinance is adopted pursuant to the authority contained in North Carolina General Statutes 153A-121 and 153A-131. It is the intent of Stokes County to protect the public against health and safety risks that exotic animals pose to the community and to protect the welfare of the individual animals held in private possession. By their very nature, exotic animals are wild and potentially dangerous and do not adjust well to a captive environment.

### **SECTION 2. DEFINITIONS**

A. "Exotic Animal" means any living member of the kingdom Animalia, including those born or raised in captivity, except the following, to which this Ordinance does not apply:

1. The species *Homo sapiens* (humans);
2. The species *Canis familiaris* (domestic dogs, excluding hybrids with wolves, coyotes, or jackals);

3. The species *Felis catus* (domestic cats, excluding hybrids with ocelots or margays);
4. The species *Equus caballus* (domestic horses);
5. The species *Equus asinus* (asses, donkeys);
6. The following members of the sub-family Bovine: the species *Bos Taurus* (cattle), the genus *Bison* (American Buffalo), and the genus *Bubalus* (water buffalo);
7. The species *Ovis ammon* (sheep);
8. The species *Capra hircus* (goats);
9. The subspecies *Sus scrofa domestica* (swine);
10. Domesticated races of the species *Gallus gallus* or *Meleagris gallapavo* (poultry);
11. Domesticated races of the species *Mesocricetus auratus* (golden hamsters);
12. Domesticated races of the subspecies *Cavia aperea procellus* (guinea pigs);
13. Domesticated races of rats and mice (white or albino, trained, laboratory reared);
14. Domesticated races of the species *Chinchillas laniger* (chinchillas);
15. Domesticated races of the species *Oryctolagus cuniculus* (rabbits);
16. Domesticated species of the family Camelid (including camels, llamas, and alpacas);
17. All captive-bred members of the species of the families Psittacidae (parrots, parakeets), Anatidae (ducks), Fringillidae (finches), Columbidae (doves and pigeons), and Ratite (flightless birds, including ostriches, emus, and rheas);
18. All captive-bred members of the species *Serinus canaria* of the class Aves (canaries);
19. Domesticated races of the species *Carassius auratus* (goldfish);
20. Captive-bred members of the superorder Teleostei of the class Osteichthyes (common freshwater and salt-water aquarium fish);
21. Captive-bred, non-poisonous members of the suborder Serpentes (snakes);
22. Captive-bred members of the suborder Cryptodira (turtles);
23. All species of the class Insecta (insects) not considered life-threatening to humans, specifically including, but not limited to, *Apis mellifera* (common honeybee);
24. All species of the class Arachnida (spiders, scorpions, and related) not considered life-threatening to humans; and,
25. Any other animal reviewed by the Stokes County Board of County Commissioners to be exempted from this Ordinance.
26. Hawkes, eagles and owls, and other birds of prey.

- B. "Harbor" means to knowingly allow an Exotic Animal, as defined herein, to remain, lodge, be fed, shelter or take refuge within a home, yard, enclosure, outbuilding, abandoned vehicle, building, place of business, or any other premises.
- C. "Impoundment" means the placement of an animal in the custody of Stokes County Animal Control or the person or entity duly authorized by Ordinance of the board of county commissioners or by state law for such purpose.
- D. "Stokes County Animal Control" means the Stokes County Animal Control Department and all designated Stokes County Animal Control Officers of Stokes County.

### **SECTION 3. POSSESSION OF EXOTIC ANIMALS PROHIBITED**

- A. Except in accordance with Section 5 (Exemptions) of this Section, it shall be unlawful for any person or entity to possess, harbor or have under their control any of the following Exotic Animals in Stokes County:
  1. Family Canidae, other than *Canis familiaris* (domestic dogs);
  2. Family Felidae, other than *Felis catus* (domestic cats);

3. Family Ursidae (bears, including hybrids);
4. Family Mustelidae (wolverines);
5. Family Hyaenidae (hyenas);
6. Order Primates (monkeys, apes, etc.);
7. Order Proboscidea, Family Elephantidae (elephants);
8. Order Perissodactyla, Family Rhinocerotidae (rhinoceroses);
9. Order Artiodactyla, Family Suidae (warthogs) and Family Hippopotamidae (hippopotamuses);
10. Order Crocodilia (crocodiles, alligators, and caimans);
11. Venomous reptiles, including all members of the following families:
  - a. Helodermidae (gila monsters and Mexican beaded lizards);
  - b. Viperidae vipers;
  - c. Crotalidae (pit vipers);
  - d. Hydrophilidae (sea snakes);
  - e. Elapidae (cobras, coral snakes, and related); and
  - f. Any rear-fanged snakes of the family Colubridae that are known to be life-threatening to humans, including but not limited to the following:
    - i. Dispholidus typus (boomslang);
    - ii. Thebtonis kirtlandii (twig snake); and
    - iii. Rhabdophis (keelbacks).
12. Any constricting snake greater than four (4) feet in length or 20 pounds in weight;
13. Any species of the class Insecta (insects) considered life-threatening to humans in general;
14. Any species of the class Arachnida (spiders, scorpions, and related) considered life-threatening to humans in general;
15. Any species of the genera Catoprion, Pygocentrus, Pygopristis, Rooseveltiella, Serrasalmus, Serrasalmo, and Taddiyella of the superorder Teleostei of the class Osteichthyes (piranhas); and
16. Any other Exotic Animal that may be a danger to the health, safety and general welfare of the residents of Stokes County and any other persons present in the County.

#### **SECTION 4. PENALTIES**

- A. For the protection of the public, failure to comply with the provisions of this Ordinance shall be grounds for immediate seizure and impoundment of any Exotic Animal(s) by Stokes County Animal Control without the necessity of a written order or a court order.
- B. Criminal penalties. If any person or entity shall violate this Ordinance or any provision thereof, they shall be guilty of a Class 3 misdemeanor and shall be fined not more than five hundred dollars (\$500.00). Each day of violation of any provision of this Ordinance shall constitute a separate offense. The payment of a fine imposed in criminal proceedings pursuant to this subsection does not relieve the person of liability for any taxes, fees, costs, or penalties otherwise imposed under this Ordinance.
- C. Civil penalties. In addition to all other penalties prescribed by law and seizure of the Exotic Animal(s), any person or entity who violates any provision of this Ordinance shall be subject to a civil penalty of \$1,000 per Exotic Animal and an additional \$250 per day for each day the Exotic Animal is in the custody of Stokes County plus any additional costs incurred by Stokes County in the seizure of the Exotic Animal(s).
- D. Citations. Stokes County Animal Control is authorized to issue written citations to violators of this Ordinance. The penalty must be paid within seventy-two (72) hours after the person has been cited for violation of this Ordinance. The citation may be delivered in person to the violator; or, if the violator cannot be readily found, the citation may be mailed to the violator by first-class or certified mail. No impounded animal may be redeemed from the county animal shelter until all incurred

penalties have been paid in full; and until arrangements have been made for the safe transportation of the animal outside of Stokes County.

- E. Enforcement. Stokes County Animal Control and/or any law enforcement agency having jurisdiction where an exotic animal is found shall have authority to enforce this Ordinance.

## **SECTION 5. EXEMPTIONS**

- A. Provided that each Exotic Animal, as defined by this Ordinance, is maintained in a secure enclosure constructed and maintained to prevent the Exotic Animal's escape and compliant with the requirements of N.C. Gen. Stat. § 14-417, § 14-417.1, and § 14-417.2, and the further requirements set forth herein, the prohibitions of this Ordinance shall not apply to:
1. Federal or State licensed wildlife rehabilitators engaged in the rehabilitation of sick, injured, or orphaned native wildlife to the extent permitted by their license; provided that said wildlife is housed on a parcel or tract of land containing not less than one hundred acres, and all structures, boundary fences, perimeter fences and animal enclosures are located five hundred (500) feet or more from the property line; and provided further that the rehabilitator maintains liability insurance with a minimum of \$1,000,000 per claim to compensate any person for personal injury or property damage caused by the wildlife; and provided further that the rehabilitator has first obtained a Permit in accordance with Section 7 of this Ordinance. Possession of wildlife not native to Stokes County is strictly prohibited.
  2. Lawfully operated non-resident carnivals, circuses, and traveling fairs for no longer than seven consecutive days, and a maximum of two times per calendar year; provided that the owner and/or operator maintains liability insurance with a minimum of \$1,000,000 per claim to compensate any person for personal injury or property damage caused by the Exotic Animal; and provided further that the owner and/or operator has first obtained from the Stokes County Animal Control Department a Permit certifying that the Exotic Animals are held, maintained and exhibited in compliance with this Section.
  3. Veterinary clinics operated by a veterinarian licensed by the North Carolina Veterinary Medical Board in possession of Exotic Animals for treatment or rehabilitation purposes.
  4. Persons temporarily transporting Exotic Animals non-stop through Stokes County on state maintained highways, provided that such time in Stokes County shall not exceed twelve (12) hours; and provided further that the transporter maintains liability insurance with a minimum of \$1,000,000 per claim to compensate any person for personal injury or property damage caused by transportation of the Exotic Animals.
  5. Properly licensed and established zoos provided said zoo is established or exists on a parcel or tract of land containing not less than one hundred acres; and provided further the structures, boundary fences, perimeter fences and animal enclosures are located five hundred (500) feet or more from the property line; and provided further that the zoo maintains liability insurance with a minimum of \$1,000,000 per claim to compensate any person for personal injury or property damage caused by the Exotic Animal(s); and provided further that the zoo has first obtained a Permit in accordance with Section 7 of this Ordinance.
  6. No references or restrictions in this Ordinance shall apply to Exotic Animals under the exclusive custody and control of the North Carolina Zoological Park.

## **SECTION 6. IMPOUNDMENT AND DISPOSITION OF ANIMALS**

- A. Any Exotic Animal which is kept by any person or entity in violation of this Ordinance may be immediately seized without notice and impounded by Stokes County Animal Control without the necessity of a written order or a court order, for the protection of the public or the health of the Exotic Animal.
- B. If the Exotic Animal cannot be seized and impounded safely by Stokes County Animal Control OR if proper and safe housing cannot be found for the animal, Stokes County Animal Control may immediately destroy the Exotic Animal.
- C. The owner of an impounded Exotic Animal may reclaim the Exotic Animal if the person or entity provides proof of ownership and satisfies Stokes County Animal Control that a safe and prompt transfer of the Exotic Animal to an appropriate location outside of the county has been arranged; and provided further that all monetary fines, penalty and costs imposed under this Ordinance have been paid in full.
- D. If the owner of an impounded Exotic Animal cannot be located or if an impounded Exotic Animal remains unclaimed, in the discretion of the head of Stokes County Animal Control or his or her designee, Stokes County Animal Control may euthanize the animal, turn the Exotic Animal over to the North Carolina Museum of Natural Science or to the North Carolina Zoological Park, allow it to be lawfully adopted by a zoo, or return it to an appropriate wilderness.

## **SECTION 7. PERMIT PROCESS**

- A. This permit process shall apply to Section 5A.(1) and (5) of this Ordinance.
- B. Payment of the nonrefundable annual permit fee of \$1,000.00 shall constitute the beginning of the permit process. Any other cost incurred during this permit process shall be the responsibility of the owner or possessor of the Exotic Animal.
- C. Applicants beginning the permit/registration process for an Exotic Animal shall be given a list of restrictions that must be in place before a permit will be issued.
- D. Restrictions for the issuance of a permit for an Exotic Animal shall include, but not be limited to the following:
  - 1. Proof of liability insurance coverage with a minimum of \$1,000,000 per claim to compensate any person for personal injury or property damage caused by the Exotic Animal, or in lieu of insurance, a surety bond posted with the county manager in the same amount, conditioned upon payment of such damages.
  - 2. At the direction of Stokes County Animal Control, installation of permanent signage at all points of entry to the property in question to identify the presence of the Exotic Animal to any law enforcement or emergency personnel having valid reason to enter the property.
  - 3. Required signage shall consist of a minimum size of three (3) square feet and shall at a minimum identify the following in reflective letters of a contrasting color as to be easily read on the background of the sign:
    - i. The word "Warning" in all capitals at least four (4) inches high;
    - ii. The common name of the Exotic Animal;

- iii. The location on the property of the Exotic Animal; and
  - iv. The potential danger posed by the Exotic Animal (biting, clawing, venom, constriction, kicking, etc.)
4. When possible, implantation by a county-approved veterinarian of a microchip under the skin of the Exotic Animal to aid in identification, or approval by a county-approved veterinarian of a previously implanted microchip. Obtaining from a county-approved veterinarian a health certificate detailing the health and condition of the Exotic Animal.
  5. Written emergency response plan, approved by Stokes County Animal Control, in the event of any escape of the Exotic Animal, including a paragraph detailing owner or possessor's understanding and agreement that if the escaped Exotic Animal poses any immediate danger whatsoever to life, limb, or property (other than property of the Exotic Animal owner), then it may be destroyed at that time by law enforcement officers, emergency responders, or any citizen having the means to do so. This emergency response plan shall be signed by the owner.
  6. All Exotic Animals shall be housed in facilities designed with the characteristics and potential dangers of the particular Exotic Animal in mind, and shall comply with the provisions of N.C. Gen. Stat. § 14-417, § 14-417.1, and § 14-417.2.

E. Issuance of a permit

1. When the Exotic Animal owner or possessor has completed the list of requirements, but no later than 90 days from the beginning of the permit process, the owner shall contact and arrange for an initial inspection by Stokes County Animal Control, which shall not unreasonably delay this initial inspection.
2. When Stokes County Animal Control has conducted its initial inspection and found the list of requirements to have been completed in a satisfactory manner, it shall issue the permit to the owner or possessor of the Exotic Animal.
3. For all persons or entities claiming exemption to this Ordinance through Section 5A.(1) above, the term of each permit shall be six (6) months. This shall be renewable only upon proof of evaluation of the Exotic Animal(s) in the last ten (10) days by a licensed North Carolina veterinarian who determines that the Exotic Animal(s) require additional rehabilitation. Continuing renewal after one year shall also require payment of the annual fee of \$1,000.00.
4. For all persons or entities claiming exemption to this Ordinance through Section 5A.(5) above, the initial term of this permit shall be twelve (12) months. This permit shall be renewable every twelve (12) months for either the life of the Exotic Animal or the length of its residency in Stokes County, whichever is lessor, upon payment of an annual permit renewal fee and satisfactory completion of a follow-up inspection by Stokes County Animal Control of the facility housing the Exotic Animal.
5. This permit shall be presented for renewal prior to the expiration of the current term; otherwise, the permit is considered expired.
6. Any owner or possessor of an Exotic Animal with an expired permit for that Exotic Animal shall be in violation of this Ordinance, and the owner or possessor shall be subject to the penalties listed in Section 4 of this Ordinance.

- F. A permit holder shall correct within seven (7) calendar days any defects that may arise in connection with that permit or face the penalties of Section 4.



## **SECTION 8. COSTS**

- A. In the event any investigation of an Exotic Animal facility (other than the inspection associated with the renewal of a permit in Section 6) is required or requested, and the complaint is substantiated by Stokes County Animal Control, then the reasonable cost of the investigation shall be assessed against the owner or possessor of the Exotic Animal.
- B. If at any time it becomes necessary to impound or destroy an Exotic Animal pursuant to this Ordinance, then the cost of such impoundment or destruction shall be assessed against the owner or possessor of the Exotic Animal.

## **SECTION 9. BREEDING/REPRODUCTION**

- A. Breeding or allowing the reproduction of prohibited Exotic Animals listed in Section 3.A of this Ordinance is specifically prohibited.
- B. Any owner or possessor of an Exotic Animal found to be in violation of the above paragraph shall be in violation of this Ordinance, and the owner or possessor shall be subject to immediate seizure of the Exotic Animal and the imposition of a fine for each Exotic Animal of \$1,000 plus \$250 per day or each day the Exotic Animal is in the custody of Stokes County, plus any additional costs to the county that may arise in connection with seizure of the Exotic Animal.

## **SECTION 10. JUDICIAL ENFORCEMENT**

The provisions of this Ordinance may be enforced in the District Court of Stokes County.

## **SECTION 11. SEVERABILITY**

If any provision of this Ordinance or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions or applications of the Ordinance, which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this Ordinance are declared severable.

## **SECTION 12. EFFECTIVE DATE OF ORDINANCE**

This Ordinance amends, revises and replaces the existing Stokes County Exotic Animal Control Ordinance that was adopted on April 26, 2004; and shall take effect on the \_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2016.

Any person in violation of the Ordinance on its effective date shall have five (5) calendar days within which to come into compliance, or safely remove the exotic animal(s) from Stokes County. Removal from Stokes County shall be conducted under the supervision of Stokes County Animal Control and in accordance with procedures approved by Stokes County Animal Control to insure the safety of the general public. The foregoing notwithstanding, in the event any exotic animal poses an imminent threat or danger to the general public, Stokes County Animal Control, or any law enforcement officer having jurisdiction, shall immediately seize and impound the exotic animal in accordance with Section 6 of this Ordinance.

\_\_\_\_\_  
J. Leon Inman, CHAIRMAN  
STOKES COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Darlene Bullins  
CLERK TO THE BOARD

February 8, 2016

County Manager Morris presented the following comments:

- County Attorney Ty Browder added a few minor changes that are included in the revision presented to the Board today
- This ordinance has not been looked at in a long time
- County Attorney Browder can comment on his changes
- There is a sense of urgency with this ordinance and needs to be placed on today's Action Agenda

County Attorney Ty Browder presented the following comments:

- Spent quite a bit of time with Chief Animal Control Officer Kevin Webster reviewing the County's current Exotic Animal Ordinance
- Tried to simplify the ordinance and include some situations that were not included in the County's current ordinance
- One major change was to eliminate the exotic animal committee
- Permit Process (Section 7) was changed
- Reviewed and revised Section 5 – Exemptions
- Will be glad to answer any questions

Chairman Inman opened the floor for discussion.

Vice Chairman Booth commented:

- Confirmed with County Attorney Browder that the old ordinance was a \$1,000 per animal and the revised ordinance will be \$1,000 per permit

County Attorney Browder commented:

- Under the revised ordinance, you are prohibiting exotic animals except for the exemptions
- Could be very costly or prohibitive to the individual who has several animals that fall under the exemptions
- My thought process was if you are going to have exemptions, you need to be practical with some restrictions
- The fee can be increased if so desired by the Board

Commissioner Walker commented:

- Questioned how does this apply to someone farming an exotic animal not native to Stokes County that doesn't bother anyone and has been doing this for years?
- Can they continue to operate their business?

County Attorney Browder responded:

- Section 2 lists those animals to which this ordinance does not apply
- If not listed, the ordinance allows for animals to be reviewed by the Stokes County Board of County Commissioners and to be exempted from the ordinance
- The Board can exempt any animal if chooses to do so
- The Board can consider any animal on a case per case basis in the future
- If it is not exempted under Section 2 of this ordinance, it is considered an exotic animal and would not be admitted unless it fell under the exemptions in Section 5

Commissioner Walker continued:

- Very thorough
- One thing that caught my attention was the possession of wildlife not native to Stokes County is strictly prohibited – Section 5 (1)

County Attorney Browder responded:

- That falls under the rehabilitation of sick, injured or orphaned native wildlife to Stokes County
- The Board can expand to native to North Carolina if desired

Commissioner Walker continued:

- Feel this ordinance is on the right track
- Am on board

Commissioner Jones commented:

- Feel we can adopt this revision today, but will probably have to keep refining just like we do with our regular Animal Control Ordinance
- Too broad and too comprehensive to be able to include everything needed
- Don't want to inhibit Economic Development
- Good start

County Attorney Browder commented:

- Need to be flexible
- Agree with Commissioner Jones that there will be situations that will come up that weren't thought about
- The purpose of this ordinance is for the protection of the general public
- The Board can always look at each individual case and if it isn't a public safety concern, can amend the ordinance

Commissioner Lankford commented:

- Have reviewed the new changes submitted today
- On board with the revised ordinance
- Would suggest placing the item on today's Action Agenda
- Make improvements if needed

Commissioner Walker commented:

- Would like input from Chief Animal Control Officer Webster and the folks from King who have taken time to be here today
- See where Commissioner Lankford is coming from and also where Commissioner Jones is coming from; would prefer Action at the next meeting since this is a lot to digest
- Really think we are on the right track, but would like to see us follow our regular protocol

Chief Animal Control Officer Webster responded:

- Do not have any comments at this time

- My thoughts and suggestions have already been incorporated into the document prepared by County Attorney Browder
- Feel the County should move on this today
- Feel there is a potential dangerous situation possibly that needs to be handled as quickly as possible

Commissioner Walker confirmed with Chief Animal Control Officer Webster that he felt there were benefits and/or advantages in going ahead and taking action on this today.

King City Manager Homer Dearmin commented:

- Concur with Chief Animal Control Officer Webster that there are situations that we also feel are a public safety concern and do not have a mechanism to address those
- The sooner this could be addressed the better

Chief of Police Paula May concurred with City Manager Dearmin and stated that immediate action should be taken today.

Vice Chairman Booth questioned Chief of Police May if this ordinance is in compliance of what we need?

Chief of Police May responded:

- Feel this ordinance is in the right direction from my perspective of the public safety issue
- There may be other minor issues to be addressed later
- As Police Chief, do not see any reason for delaying the adoption of this ordinance

Chairman Inman commented:

- Chief of Police May mentioned safety and welfare, should not overlook public health
- Been dealing with the Zika virus
- Exotic animals from another country could impose a health threat

The Board agreed to move the last revision submitted by County Attorney Browder of the Exotic Animal Ordinance to today's Action Agenda.

Chairman Inman, with full consent of the Board, directed the Clerk to place the item on today's Action Agenda.

## **Economic Development Recommendation – Economic Development Assessment Planning Committee**

County Manager Rick Morris presented the following comments regarding the Economic Development Recommendation from the Economic Development Assessment Planning Committee:

- Chairman David Sudderth will be presenting the Committee's recommendation
- The Committee had presented an interim recommendation at a previous meeting
- Based on the feedback from that meeting, the committee went back and discussed the recommendation further
- Feel this recommendation is a better way to approach Economic Development
- This recommendation will carry the County until July 2017
- Do have a good bit of economic development activity going on in several areas
- Would request action at the next meeting for reasons contained in the recommendation
- Commissioner Jones and Commissioner Walker served on the Committee and may have further comments

Chairman David Sudderth, Economic Development Assessment Planning Committee, (EDAPC) presented the following recommendation:

- Extend until June 30, 2017 David Sudderth's temporary reclassification as the Interim Economic Development Director at the same salary
- Do a one-year temporary reclassification from July 1, 2016 to June 30, 2017 for the Arts Council Director Eddy McGee, which adds Economic Development duties to his current job description, to include grant writing, along with his regular duties as Arts Council Director
  - This temporary reclassification would include a pay increase of approximately one half of the increase given to David Sudderth for serving as Interim Economic Development Director
- Reclassify and fill the non-appropriated Economic Development position (grade 65) to Economic Development Technical Analyst (grade 71) and competitively fill this position
- Incorporate all of the above listed changes with detailed explanations in the Fiscal Year 2016-17 Budget Proposal to the Board of County Commissioners, with the exception of David Sudderth's extension, which if not approved as part of this recommendation must be approved separately by the Board before March 2016
- Delay for at least one additional year the filling of the position of Economic Development Director pending further assessment of the department
- Continue the assessment of the Economic Development Commission activities to better clarify the role of this committee for the future

- This proposal will provide the best operational approach for Economic Development during the coming year as several major Economic Development projects are completed which include the Art Market upgrade
- This proposal will also continue the cost savings gained with the interim organizational structure of the Economic Development Department for an additional year by absorbing administrative functions into the Planning Department, as we are currently doing and will free up funding for critical Economic Development projects such as internet expansion
- The Economic Development Assessment and Planning Committee stays intact and continues to assess the Economic Development function with the meetings to be held on an as needed basis

EDAPC Chairman Sudderth commented:

- Committee has had several lengthy discussions regarding the recommendation
- Will be happy to answer any questions

Chairman Inman opened the floor for discussion.

Commissioner Lankford commented:

- The only item that I see that this Board needs to be dealing with today is the temporary reclassification as the Interim Economic Development Director for David Sudderth – first bullet
- Do not know why any of the other bullets need to be addressed today

Vice Chairman Booth commented:

- First bullet extends David Sudderth's temporary reclassification as the Interim Economic Development Director until June 30, 2017
- Agree with Commissioner Lankford that the other information does not need to be discussed today
- Would like to have the option to reappoint David Sudderth again after June 30, 2017
- Feel we have a person who is doing a good job in Economic Development
- Would like to see it done for three years

County Manager Morris commented:

- Can be extended after June 30, 2017, but there a lot of things changing
- Would not want to lock in for no more than a year at the time

Vice Chairman Booth continued:

- Would like to extend more than one year due to revenue potentials in this arrangement that will be needed down the road
- Would like to see David Sudderth's temporary reclassification extended for three years due to potential cost savings and the need for additional revenue

EDAPC Chairman Sudderth responded:

- Feel at this time I can't guarantee for three years as I will be eligible for retirement in July 2016
- This recommendation is what this Board tasked the committee to do
- The committee has worked diligently to come up with this recommendation
- Have six other jobs such as the Planning Director
- Have a lot of things going on
- The committee feels for Economic Development to proceed, there needs to be some assistance
- Enjoy doing the job, but there are things that I can't get done because of my other duties

Commissioner Jones commented:

- There has been a lot of energy, time, and personal resources put into this recommendation
- To say that only one thing applies today is a little hard to swallow
- Committee is thinking comprehensively
- Three years sounds nice, but reality is that we can only handle one year at a time
- Feel collectively, this needs to be reassessed once a year to see where we are at and if we have made our benchmarks
- We know what infrastructure is working and what needs to be done to move forward
- My question is: "Do we want to move forward with Economic Development or are we just going to stay stagnant?"
- To lock in for three years with so many changes, I don't think we are doing Economic Development any justice and doing the county any justice
- We were charged to do a job and we have done our job
- Feel there needs to be some trust and some confidence that what we came up with is valid and move forward

Commissioner Walker commented:

- Agree with the recommendation presented by EDAPC Chairman Sudderth
- Agree with Commissioner Jones' comments
- Been a privilege to be a part of this process
- As mentioned by Commissioner Jones, there has been a lot of work and thought put into this recommendation
- The committee did not take the task lightly
- Have kept the Board of Commissioners informed
- The committee sees this recommendation as a workable concept that can continue to move the County forward in Economic Development in a very cost effective way
- I do lean toward a year
- Need to see how things look after that year and go from there
- This is a compromise, tried to incorporate some of the views of other commissioners into this recommendation by using existing resources instead of changing the game again

- Hope to maximize the effectiveness of David Sudderth, Eddy McGee and others involved and at the same time have cost savings
- Will be glad to answer any questions

Commissioner Lankford commented:

- Do not have any questions; just need to handle the first bullet

Commissioner Walker commented:

- Does not need action today
- Can be placed on the Action Agenda for the next meeting

Vice Chairman Booth questioned what kind of savings would there be?

EDAPC Chairman Sudderth responded:

- Do not have exact dollar amounts
- Planning Department has absorbed all the line items except marketing, professional services, etc. – those items that are needed for Economic Development
- Do not use any travel
- Recommendation was made with the idea that more can be done in Economic Development
- There are cost savings, but there is a cost to doing Economic Development
- There is a lot of technical support needed in that department, dealing on a daily basis with applications, software, social media, etc.
- There are things that I just cannot do
- There could be as much as \$100,000 saved last year by combining the departments
- I was not tasked to just save dollars, I was also tasked with doing a job
- Believed we saved money, but accomplished more
- Been trying to keep the Board updated

County Manager Morris commented:

- Will save essentially what it did this year with the exception of marketing and two additional personnel reclassifications to up the tempo
- Still significantly be less than hiring an Economic Development Director at this time

Vice Chairman Booth questioned if it was not adequate enough by using IT staff?

EDAPC Chairman Sudderth responded:

- I recruited what I needed
- Was able to get an IT person who Manager Morris loaned to the Economic Development Department
- This person has become very valuable and integral to the department
- Would like to see this position filled in the future
- This is something that needs to be done whether I am doing the job or someone else
- Have created the Hanging Rock application that is very technical and managed daily
- Websites have to be updated and maintained



- This current arrangement has provided a presence in the office when I am not available
- Now there is a presence in Economic Development or a note on the door to see someone in Planning
- Also got assistance from the Arts Council Director who has valuable marketing skills
- He is a producer of Economic Development in this County
- Not sure everyone realizes what the Arts Council Director does for Economic Development
- Look at what is happening in Danbury as far as Economic Development – Riverstreet Facility going up, new drugstore getting ready to open with a restaurant, a new Art Market, along with other things happening in the County such as the new Walmart in King
- Will continue on with the Board's pleasure

Vice Chairman Booth continued:

- Confirmed with Manager Morris that the IT person that is helping in Economic Development still reports to IT and still does assignments for IT

EDAPC Chairmen Sudderth continued:

- There has been a tremendous amount money spent for professional services over the years that were farmed out for Economic Development
- One goal is to bring all the IT functions back into the County saving county dollars
- Economic Development deals with IT and marketing functioning

Vice Chairman Booth confirmed with EDAPC Chairman Sudderth that sharing the IT position has worked this past year.

County Manager Morris noted that any more discussion about the use of the IT person would need to be discussed in Closed Session.

Commissioner Lankford commented:

- Reiterated that there is only one bullet that needs to be discussed today – the first bullet

Chairman Inman commented:

- We need to disband the entire committee if we are not going to discuss the complete recommendation

Commissioner Lankford commented:

- The other items will be discussed during budget time
- The only urgent thing that needs action is the temporary reclassification as the Interim Economic Development Director for David Sudderth until June 30, 2017
- That is the only thing needed for action at the next meeting

Commissioner Walker commented:

- Feel there needs to be a Closed Session to discuss certain aspects of this recommendation
- If this changes, there may be some critical personnel issues that the Board needs to be made aware of
- This recommendation includes reclassifying and filling a non-appropriated Economic Development position
- We are replacing (temporarily) an Economic Development Director position at a salary of approximately \$70,000 with an Economic Technical Analyst at a much lower salary along with a portion of David's and the Arts Council Director's time and salary at a total cost savings to the County
- This is a concept that will probably work well for Economic Development

Chairman Inman thanked the committee for working on this and providing the Board with a recommendation.

Chairman Inman commented:

- From my perspective, the two things that need action now would be:
  - Delay for at least one additional year the filling of the position of Economic Development Director pending further assessment of the department
  - Extend until June 30, 2017 David Sudderth's temporary reclassification as the Interim Economic Development Director at the same salary
- The other recommendations would be considered with the Fiscal Year 2016-17 Budget

County Manager Morris noted that could be done as suggested by Chairman Inman.

County Manager Morris also noted that this is one recommendation from the Committee that can be addressed now or with the FY 2016-17 Budget process, other than David Sudderth's temporary reclassification which has to be done before March 9<sup>th</sup>.

Commissioner Walker commented:

- Before taking any action on this recommendation, there needs to be a Closed Session
- There may be some personnel aspects that need to be discussed in Closed Session

Chairman Inman responded:

- If it rises to that level, we will consider a Closed Session for the next meeting.

The Board discussed placing the item on the next Action Agenda and a majority agreed to place the items that must be dealt with now on the Action Agenda for the next meeting.

Chairman Inman, with full consent of the Board, directed the Clerk to place the items that

needed immediate attention on the February 22<sup>nd</sup> Action Agenda.

**Proposed Resolution – Supporting Connect NC Bond Act**

Chairman Inman presented the following proposed Resolution in Support of Connect NC Bond Act:

**RESOLUTION SUPPORTING CONNECT NC BOND ACT**

**WHEREAS** North Carolina and its counties have a mutual desire to improve and enhance the quality of life for all of our state's citizens; and

**WHEREAS** the North Carolina Community College System is in need of new and renovated facilities to educate and prepare students and workers for the 21<sup>st</sup> century for the purpose of enhancing the economic attractiveness of the State; and

**WHEREAS** Clean water and sewer systems are essential to attract new and strengthen existing industry and to provide for the needs of the State and its growing population; and

**WHEREAS** having parks and public facilities accessible to children and veterans with disabilities is essential to improving the quality of life for our most vulnerable citizens; and

**WHEREAS** financing these costs through a bond is the most economical and affordable way to address these infrastructure needs; and

**WHEREAS** the Connect NC Bond Act will provide funding for many critical needs facing North Carolina that will improve and enhance the quality of life in our counties;

**NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the **Stokes County Board of County Commissioners** that it does hereby express its support for the Connect NC Bond Act; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that a copy of this resolution is sent to all 100 counties with encouragement for each county to adopt a similar resolution; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that copies of this resolution are transmitted to the members of the General Assembly and to Governor Pat McCrory to let them know of our support for the Connect NC Bond Act.

**ADOPTED**, this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2016 by the Stokes County Board of Commissioners.

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Chairman J. Leon Inman**

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

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Commissioner Ernest Lankford**

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

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

Chairman Inman noted:

- There are different levels of support for the NC Connect Bond out in the community
- Started out with a transportation bond and changed to a Connect Bond
- Hanging Rock State will get approximately \$2.1 million for Camp Sertoma/Vade Mecum which will help to get that facility going again
- Park staff will be asking the community for a new name for Camp Sertoma/Vade Mecum

County Manager Morris commented:

- Forsyth Tech will get approximately \$5 million with part of that coming to Stokes County

Chairman Inman opened the floor for discussion.

Commissioner Walker commented:

- Want to see things happen at Camp Sertoma/Vade Mecum
- Support seeing things happen; however, we do have citizens that are strongly opposed to this bond referendum
- I am going to support this bond referendum, but do we want to officially support this referendum as a Board given the potential controversy?

Vice Chairman Booth commented:

- Normally, I would not be for this
- But there has been a lot of work done to get Camp Sertoma/Vade Mecum transferred over to the State Parks System
- The referendum has changed from highways to infrastructure and colleges
- Last year, this county got approximately \$70,000 to pave one tenth of a mile, not sure we would have gotten any funding if it had stayed a transportation bond
- In this referendum, Hanging Rock State Park will get approximately \$2.1 million that will be used towards Camp Sertoma/Vade Mecum
- This is a big start to getting things done at Camp Sertoma/Vade Mecum
- The only reason I would support this resolution would be for the \$2.1 million coming to Hanging Rock State Park for Camp Sertoma/Vade Mecum

Commissioner Walker commented:

- Questioned if we don't receive the \$2.1 million for the Camp Sertoma/Vade Mecum, where does the project stand?

County Manager Morris responded:

- Park officials stated at the meeting that if we don't get the \$2.1 million, there will be no funding available for Camp Sertoma/Vade Mecum

Commissioner Jones commented:

- Have mixed feelings about this bond referendum
- When we heard about this bond about a year ago, we were not too in favor of it
- This Board even wrote a letter about this bond referendum

- Governor's office actually called me about the letter
- Spoke to our Senator, will get some funding for a specific project, but at the end of the day, it will not help the rural communities
- Not sure I feel good about the Board taking a stand on this resolution
- Not sure it is the best thing for the Board overall to take a stand

Commissioner Walker commented:

- May put this Board in an awkward position to get caught in the middle to what could be a potential controversial issue

Commissioner Lankford commented:

- Feel it will not make any difference whether we approve the resolution or not
- Do not think this resolution will have impact on whether it will pass or not pass

Commissioner Jones commented:

- It is the perception

Commissioner Lankford continued:

- Don't think it will be of any merit to passing a resolution

Commissioner Walker confirmed with Manager Morris that this will be on the March ballot.

Commissioner Walker noted that he was not in favor of acting on this proposed resolution right now.

Commissioner Jones and Commissioner Lankford both agreed with Commissioner Walker not to take any action on the proposed resolution right now.

Chairman Inman requested the desire of the Board regarding Action on this proposed Resolution.

Commissioner Walker commented:

- Want to see things at Camp Sertoma/Vade Mecum as much as anyone
- Little bit cautious, based on history, of doing anything or indication of trying to tell the voters how to vote

Chairman Inman noted the Board had this type of resolution before.

Commissioner Jones noted it really could be perceived as influencing the votes.

Commissioners Jones noted that everyone can cast their ballots in March.

Chairman Inman commented:

- NC Association of County Commissioners unanimously adopted the resolution
- Plan to write a personal letter of support
- Not sure what impact/ perception there might be if not voted on by this Board considering funding for Camp Sertoma/Vade Mecum is involved

Vice Chairman Booth noted he did not see any difference in writing a letter of support or approving it by the Board.

Chairman Inman tabled the proposed resolution until further discussion.

Vice Chairman Booth commented for the record:

- I stand by my previous statement "The only reason I would support the resolution would be for the \$2.1 million coming to Hanging Rock State Park for Camp Sertoma/Vade Mecum"
- Lot of work was done to get Camp Sertoma/Vade Mecum transferred to the Parks System

Chairman Inman agreed with Vice Chairman Booth's stand towards the proposed resolution.

Commissioner Walker stated that he did not know where our Senator stood on the resolution, but our former State Representative vigorously opposed the proposed resolution.

Chairman Inman suggested talking to our state representative and placing it back on a future Agenda is so desired by a Board member.

#### **Proposed Resolution – Supporting Prevention Partners Statewide Wellness Initiative**

Chairman Inman presented the following proposed Resolution in Support of Prevention Partners Statewide Wellness Initiative:

#### **RESOLUTION SUPPORTING PREVENTION PARTNERS STATEWIDE WELLNESS INITIATIVE**

**WHEREAS** North Carolina counties strive to create a healthy workforce environment for county employees; and

**WHEREAS** North Carolina counties are responsible for providing public health services to citizens; and

**WHEREAS** Prevention Partners builds healthier communities through a suite of products that guide schools, workplaces, hospitals and clinics to address the leading causes of preventable disease, such as tobacco use, poor nutrition, physical inactivity and obesity; and

**WHEREAS** The Healthy Together NC campaign draws on a broad partnership crossing the public and private sectors to bring workplace health and wellness to hospitals, businesses, schools, government agencies, nonprofits, universities and more; and

**WHEREAS** Prevention Partners has set a goal to build healthy workplaces across sectors in at least 10 organizations in all 100 counties of North Carolina by the year 2025; and

**WHEREAS** improving the health of citizens will help counties by reducing costs for providing public health services; and

**WHEREAS** former NCACC President Kenneth Edge, of Cumberland County, initiated the Healthy Living Presidential Taskforce in an effort to bring greater awareness to healthy living and wellness activities; and

**WHEREAS** Stokes County promotes healthy living and wellness programs.

**NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the **Stokes County Board of County Commissioners** that it does hereby express its support for the **Healthy Together NC** campaign; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that a copy of this resolution is sent to all 100 counties with encouragement for each county to become a healthy workplace.

**ADOPTED**, this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2016 by the Stokes County Board of County Commissioners.

---

**Chairman J. Leon Inman**

---

**Vice Chairman James D. Booth**

---

**Commissioner Jimmy Walker**

---

**Commissioner Ernest Lankford**

---

**Commissioner Ronda Jones**

---

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

Chairman Inman opened the floor for discussion.

The Board discussed placing the proposed Resolution in Support of Prevention Partners Statewide Wellness Initiative on the Action Agenda for the next meeting.

Chairman Inman tabled the proposed resolution until further discussion.

#### **Scheduling of Goals/Budget Work Sessions**

County Manager Rick Morris requested dates for Goals/Budget Work Sessions if desired by the Board.

Chairman Inman opened the floor for possible dates.

The Board discussed possible date for work sessions.

The Board agreed on the following dates for Goals/Budget Work Sessions:

- Monday, March 21, 2016 – 1:00 pm

- Wednesday, March 23, 2016 – 1:00 pm
- Wednesday, April 13, 2016 – 1:00 pm
- Tuesday, April 26, 2016 – 1:00 pm

Chairman Inman noted all meetings will be held in the conference room on the third floor of the Administrative Building.

### **Joint Meeting with Rockingham and Caswell Counties**

County Manager Rick Morris requested suggestions for the Agenda for the Joint Meeting with Rockingham and Caswell Counties.

Chairman Inman opened the floor for suggestions/discussion.

Chairman Inman suggested Economic Development.

Commissioner Walker commented:

- Have Manager Morris provide an update regarding internet expansion
- Would request Manager Morris question department heads for anything that he would consider rises to the level for discussion at the joint meeting
- Would like a time at this joint meeting for each commissioner to be able to make a brief comment

Commissioner Lankford commented:

- Pertains to probably only Rockingham, but would like to know their feelings on the water connection that comes from Rockingham up HWY #311 and the water connection that comes from Walnut Cove to the bridge – there is a short section with no water available
- Feel there is potential Economic Development in that area
- See how interested Rockingham might be in joining Stokes County to get that section connected
- Be of any value to discuss the potential jail expansion and their interest in placing inmates in Stokes County

Commissioner Walker responded:

- Very good suggestion
- Would like to expand the discussion to Rockingham and Stokes Counties working together on projects
- Would there be any advantage of having Sheriff Marshall there?

Chairman Inman suggested transportation issues especially HWY #311.

Vice Chairman Booth noted that his understanding from the jail expansion meeting was that County staff had already contacted both counties.



Commissioner Walker suggested possibly having an update provided at the joint meeting of where the County was at with the jail expansion project.

County Manager Morris noted that Rockingham and Caswell Counties would be given a chance to suggest items for the Agenda.

Chairman Inman, with full consent of the Board, directed the Clerk to place the item on the February 22<sup>nd</sup> Action Agenda.

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

### **Appointments – Stokes County Juvenile Crime Prevention Council**

Chairman Inman noted that Randy Cook was nominated to serve as the faith member on the Stokes County Juvenile Crime Prevention Council at the January 25<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Chairman Inman opened the floor for any further nominations.

There were no further nominations.

Chairman Inman entertained a motion to close the nominations.

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

Chairman Inman polled the Board:

Commissioner Lankford: Randy Cook

Chairman Inman: Randy Cook

Vice Chairman Booth: Randy Cook

Commissioner Walker: Randy Cook

Commissioner Jones: Randy Cook

Chairman Inman noted that the Board unanimously approved the appointment of Randy Cook to serve as the faith member on the Stokes County Juvenile Crime Prevention Council.

### **Appointments – Stokes County Community Child Protection and Child Fatality Prevention Team**

Chairman Inman noted the following were nominated for the Stokes County Community

Child Protection and Child Fatality Prevention Team at the January 25<sup>th</sup> meeting:

Stacey Elmes	DSS Director
Scott Lenhart	Health Director
Marsha Marshall	Member of DSS Staff
Det. Libby Reid - CCPT	Local Law Enforcement Officer
Sheriff Mike Marshall-CFPT	Local Law Enforcement Officer
Tom Langan	Attorney from District Attorney's Office
Jeannie Easter	Executive Director of local community action agency
Tony George	Superintendent or his designee
Bob Scofield	Local mental health professional
Jaime Kehoe	Guardian ad Litem Coordinator
Dr. Sam Newsome	Local health care provider/County Medical Director
Greg Collins	Emergency Medical Services provider or firefighter
Judge Angela Puckett	District Court Judge
Susan Hairston	Rep. of a local child care facility or Head Start
Samantha Brewster	Parent of a child who died before their 18 <sup>th</sup> birthday
Cindy Brown Stiltner	Substance Abuse Counselor
Ronda Jones – CCPT	County Commissioner
Jimmy Walker – CFPT	County Commissioner
Rusty Slate or Jeana Barneycastle	Juvenile Services
Tamara Veit or Julie Wood	Prevention Agency
Pam Hooker	Community Representative
Sheila Bowen	Community Representative
Wanda East	Team Coordinator

Chairman Inman opened the floor for any further nominations.

There were no further nominations.

Chairman Inman entertained a motion to close the nominations.

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

Chairman Inman polled the Board:

The Board unanimously approved the following appointments to the Stokes County Community Child Protection and Child Fatality Prevention Team:

Stacey Elmes	DSS Director
Scott Lenhart	Health Director
Marsha Marshall	Member of DSS Staff
Det. Libby Reid - CCPT	Local Law Enforcement Officer
Sheriff Mike Marshall-CFPT	Local Law Enforcement Officer
Tom Langan	Attorney from District Attorney's Office
Jeannie Easter	Executive Director of local community action agency
Tony George	Superintendent or his designee
Bob Scofield	Local mental health professional
Jaime Kehoe	Guardian ad Litem Coordinator
Dr. Sam Newsome	Local health care provider/County Medical Director
Greg Collins	Emergency Medical Services provider or firefighter
Judge Angela Puckett	District Court Judge
Susan Hairston	Rep. of a local child care facility or Head Start
Samantha Brewster	Parent of a child who died before their 18 <sup>th</sup> birthday
Cindy Brown Stiltner	Substance Abuse Counselor
Ronda Jones - CCPT	County Commissioner
Jimmy Walker - CFPT	County Commissioner
Rusty Slate or Jeana Barneycastle	Juvenile Services
Tamara Veit or Julie Wood	Prevention Agency
Pam Hooker	Community Representative
Sheila Bowen	Community Representative
Wanda East	Team Coordinator

#### **Appointments – Town of Walnut Cove – ETJ – Regular Member**

Clerk to the Board Darlene Bullins noted Arzell Montgomery was appointed by the Board of Commissioners at the January 25<sup>th</sup> to serve on the Town of Walnut Cove Planning/Board of Adjustments as an ETJ alternate member, but should have been appointed as a regular member. Clerk Bullins confirmed with County Attorney Tyrone Browder that the Board could make a motion to correct the appointment.

Chairman Inman entertained a motion.

Commissioner Lankford moved to correct the appointment at the January 25<sup>th</sup> meeting by approving Arzell Montgomery as a regular member to the Town of Walnut Cove Planning/Board of Adjustments instead of an alternate member. Vice Chairman Booth seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

**Proposed Amendments – An Ordinance Creating a Stokes County Animal Control Department Prescribing the Duties of the Department, Regulations, Regarding Animals and Providing for the Enforcement of Said Regulations**

Chairman Inman entertained a motion regarding the proposed Amendments – An Ordinance Creating a Stokes County Animal Control Department Prescribing the Duties of the Department, Regulations, Regarding Animals and Providing for the Enforcement of Said Regulations presented and amended by County Attorney Ty Browder at today's meeting.

Vice Chairman Booth moved to approve the proposed Amendments for the Ordinance Creating a Stokes County Animal Control Department Prescribing the Duties of the Department, Regulations, Regarding Animals and Providing for the Enforcement of Said Regulations as amended by County Attorney Browder at today's meeting. Commissioner Lankford seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

**Revised County Exotic Animal Ordinance**

Chairman Inman entertained a motion regarding the Revised County Exotic Animal Ordinance presented by County Attorney Browder at today meeting.

Commissioner Lankford moved to approved the Revised County Exotic Animal Ordinance presented by County Tyrone Browder at today's meeting. Vice Chairman Booth seconded and the motion carried unanimously.

**Adjournment**

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

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

---

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

---

**J. Leon Inman**  
**Chairman**