

**MINUTES OF A
WORK SESSION
OF THE JACKSON COUNTY
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
HELD ON
AUGUST 15, 2017**

The Jackson County Board of Commissioners met in a Work Session on August 15, 2017, 1:00 p.m., Justice and Administration Building, Room A227, 401 Grindstaff Cove Road, Sylva, North Carolina.

Present: Brian McMahan, Chairman
Charles Elders, Vice Chair
Boyce Deitz, Commissioner
Mickey Luker, Commissioner
Ron Mau, Commissioner

Don Adams, County Manager
Heather C. Baker, County Attorney
Angela M. Winchester, Clerk to Board

Vice Chairman Elders called the meeting to order.

(1) PUBLIC SCHOOLS: Present for discussions: Dr. Kim Elliott, Interim Superintendent; Ken Henke, School Board Chairman; Margaret McRae, School Board Member; Gwen Edwards, Finance Officer; and Darin Allison, Director of Capital Projects and Facilities. Also present were Scott Donald of PFA Architects and Steve Kaufman of Reece, Noland and McElrath Engineers.

Mr. Allison presented:

(a) Bid Summary for Blue Ridge School reroof and HVAC upgrades:

	<u>City Scope</u>	<u>Service One</u>
Base Bid	\$1,364,340	\$1,670,090
Unit Price #1	\$26,400	\$26,557
Alternate #1	\$171,900	\$271,474
Alternate #2	\$93,000	\$117,372
Totals	\$1,655,640	\$2,085,493
Architect Fee 7.5%	\$124,173	\$156,412
Contingency	-	-
	\$1,779,813	\$2,241,905

(b) Base bid:

- Roofs: Pods A, B, C, connector, media center, cafeteria, Early College shingles.
- HVAC: Replace A Pod single unit with 4 package heating and A/C units, replace B Pod single unit with 2 package heating and A/C units, replace C Pod single unit with 6 package units, remove and reinstall single A/C only unit on Gym connector.
- Unit Price #1: Removal and replacement of 2,200 SF of insulation and built-up roofing to match existing at roof of Gym Pod, if found to be saturated.
- Alternate #1: PVC membrane roofing and insulation (Gym).
- Alternate #M2: Replace RTU at Gym.

(c) Bid Summary for Fairview School reroof and HVAC upgrades:

	City Scope	Service One
Base Bid	\$1,002,640	\$1,124,869
Unit Price #1	\$26,400	\$24,158
Alternate #4	\$118,350	\$225,236
Alternate #M3	\$122,000	\$136,055
Totals	\$1,269,3690	\$1,510,318
Architect Fee 7.5%	\$95,205	\$113,274
Contingency	-	-
	\$1,364,595	\$1,623,592

(d) Base bid:

- Roofs: Pods A, C, D, Gym.
- HVAC: Replace Admin Pod single unit with 4 package heating and A/C units, remove and reinstall existing unit on A Pod. No work on B, C, or D Pods.
- Unit Price #1: Removal and replacement of 2,200 SF of insulation and built-up roofing to match existing at roof of Gym Pod, if found to be saturated.
- Alternate #4: White 0.060 PVC roofing membrane at Pod B.
- Alternate #M3: Replace split systems in B Pod with new systems

(e) Water at Blue Ridge:

- Original \$260,000.00
- Testing, fees, contingency, emergency reserve \$22,493.11
- QZAB Total project: \$282,493.11
- Spent to date \$71,370.36
- Lofquist cost projection \$331,610 (not gone to bid yet)

Dr. Elliott stated the DENR notification from the state was a notice of violation for discharge monitoring on May 26, 2017. They did have a routine check of copper and lead and did not receive a warning on that one, but did have to complete a recheck, which was in range. There was a notice of deficiency discharge and they were asked how often they were testing. They did not receive a monetary violation, but did receive a warning for a retest and after flushing, they were in compliance. They were uncertain if the issue was with the water tower, they only knew that the concrete at the base had to be replaced because it was crumbling.

Mr. Allison stated they would have to get a private firm to test the water in the school and at the base of the tank to make a determination.

Mr. Adams stated there were CDBG grant dollars specifically for school water and sewer, but the funds would not be awarded until late spring. Also, if they applied for the grant, there would have to be a 75% response rate by students and teachers on a study of low to moderate income families.

Dr. Elliott assured them they were clear to start school on Tuesday and they would give a good faith effort to get the response rate needed for the grant funds.

(f) Completion Summary:

- Scotts Creek complete.
- Smokey Mountain Elementary:
 - 6-8 Wing HVAC plans final - not went out to bid. Projected cost \$235,500. 15% complete.
 - Tribal water - not went out to bid. Projected cost \$303,780. 20% complete.
 - K, 2, 3, 4, 5 Commons HVAC \$377,300. 100% complete.
- Smoky Mountain High School
 - Cafeteria HVAC - \$25,631, 100% complete.
 - Domestic water leak - \$92,950, 100% complete.

- Aux Gym domestic hot water - projected \$128,800, 5% complete.
- Aux Gym locker HVAC – projected \$1,249,158, 0% complete.
- A North HVAC – projected \$89,418, 5% complete.
- A North roof – projected \$168,340, 5% complete.
- C Building HVAC - under contract \$383,589, 95% complete.
- HVAC controls - under contract \$147,552, 50% complete.
- A East, C, D, roof - under contract \$1,573,942, 80% complete.

(g) Funding Summary:

	Original	Testing, Fees, Contingency, Emg Reserve	QZAB Total Project	Spent to Date	Balance as of 7/31/17	Single Bids 7/20/17	Add'l Funds Req'd	Combined Bids 7/20/17	Add'l Funds Req'd
Fairview		\$84,473.72							
FV A Building Roof	\$125,440.00	\$10,852.06	\$136,292.06						
FV B Building Roof	\$125,440.00	\$10,852.06	\$136,292.06						
FV Commons Roof	\$215,680.00	\$18,658.90	\$234,338.90						
FV D Building Roof	\$125,440.00	\$10,852.06	\$136,292.06						
FV Repair 2 leaks Kindergarten Wing roof	\$54,000.00	\$4,671.64	\$58,671.64						
FV Administration Roof	\$140,440.00	\$12,149.74	\$152,589.74						
FV Gym Roof	\$190,000.00	\$16,437.27	\$206,437.27						
Total Fairview Elementary Project	\$976,440.00	\$84,473.72	\$1,060,913.72	\$57,727.96	\$1,003,185.76	\$1,364,595.00	(\$361,409.24)		
Blue Ridge		\$122,108.15							
Blue Ridge Gym	\$202,000.00	\$17,475.41	\$219,475.41						
Blue Ridge HVAC	\$385,200.00	\$33,324.40	\$418,524.40						
BR Cafeteria Roof	\$83,400.00	\$7,215.10	\$90,615.10						
BR Water Tower	\$260,000.00	\$22,493.11	\$282,493.11						
BR Buildings A,B,C roof	\$430,860.00	\$37,274.54	\$468,134.54						
BREC Metal Roof Repair	\$50,000.00	\$4,325.60	\$54,325.60						
Total Blue Ridge Project	\$1,411,460.00	\$122,108.15	\$1,533,568.15	\$71,370.36	\$1,462,197.79	\$1,779,813.00	(\$317,615.21)		
Total Combined Projects	\$2,387,900.00	\$205,581.87	\$2,594,481.87	\$129,098.32	\$2,465,383.55	\$3,144,408.00	(\$679,024.45)	\$3,092,620.00 City Scope	(\$627,236.45)
Testing, Fees, Contingency Emergency Reserves	\$341,505.00								
	\$375,107.00								
	\$716,612.00								

Ms. Fox stated if they choose both base bids and all alternates they would need an additional \$361,409.24 just for Fairview.

Mr. Adams stated if they took the bids separately, the shortfall would be \$679,024, if they combined it would reduce the short fall to \$627,235.

Ms. Fox stated the funds could come from the school’s capital reserve, which had a total of \$1.7mil available funds.

Commissioner Luker stated that if they moved forward with the three projects, which were \$2.6 mil and they had \$1.4 mil in reserves, it would leave \$1.2 mil.

Ms. Fox stated they had funds that would build to the current year that could be added to the \$1.7. They budgeted around \$700,000 and Articles 40 and 42 Sales Tax would also be available.

Mr. Adams stated that they also had \$300,000 that they budgeted for roof maintenance. If the Board wanted to see all of the projects funded in the next year, he would request time for him and Darlene to come up with a plan.

Consensus: *The Board wanted all of the projects funded in the next year, including the water at Blue Ridge School, with or without grants. Mr. Adams and Ms. Fox to work on a plan to fund all projects. Also, add an item to the next regular agenda for the Board to consider allocating an additional \$627,236.00 to give the go ahead for projects that were out to bid. Also, the Board thought it was very important to address the water issue at Blue Ridge School. They requested that Victor Lofquist inquire about a private company performing water tests at Blue Ridge School. The School Board would report back the findings and recommendations concerning the water testing to the Board at the next regular meeting.*

(2) GLENVILLE LAKE – NO WAKE ZONE: Margaret McRae and Joyce Waterbury stated there were a part of a group of residents and homeowners in the county. They were petitioning the Board of Commissioners to request that the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission investigate the establishment of a No Wake Zone on Glenville Lake for an area that consisted of a narrow passage between the mainland and two islands at the north end of the lake.

The safety of the area had been negatively impacted by the significant increase in boat traffic in the past three years, which had arisen due to the enhancements made to the Powerhouse Boarding Access Area, the Pine Creek Boating Access and the Pines Recreation Area. As a result of the increased boat traffic, both boaters and swimmers were endangered.

Consensus: *Place this item on the next regular meeting agenda for consideration.*

(3) NANTAHALA AND PISGAH NATIONAL FOREST PLAN REVISION: Michael Poston, Planning Director stated that the Forest Service was revising the plan for the Nantahala and Pisgah National Forest. The Forest Plan was a general framework to guide forest management considering economic, social and environmental factors.

The overarching goals of the plan were to:

- Enhance and restore resiliency
- Provide clean and abundant water
- Connect people to the land (recreation opportunities, cultural resources, lands, etc.)
- Opportunities to partner with others.

The Forest Service plan describes seven different geographic areas, but the Great Balsam and Highland Dome areas were found in the county. The Great Balsam Geographic area included much of north and central Jackson County as it borders Qualla Boundary and included Sylva, Cullowhee, Whittier and Dillsboro Communities.

The overarching goals of the Forest Plan were similar to some of the goals identified in the Land use Plan. More specifically, Natural Resources Goal 1 of Jackson County's Land Use Plan was "to preserve the habitat for identified endangered species". The goal was consistent with the Forest Service goal for the Great Balsam area: "Enhancing and restoring resiliency by conserving and improving high elevation red oaks forests, northern hardwood forests and spruce-fir forests". The Forest Service goal for the Great Balsam area was to "provide clean and abundant water by enhancing brook trout where habitat was suitable through restored aquatic organism passage and population augmentation" and was consistent with Jackson County's Natural Resources Goal 3 "to encourage development that minimizes impervious surfaces" and Natural Resources Goal 5 "limit commercial and industrial development along the Tuckasegee River and other trout waters".

The Forest Service goal to “connect people to the land (recreation opportunities, cultural resources, lands, etc.)” was consistent with Jackson County’s Public Health Goal 2 “to promote physical activity within the county by promoting and encouraging the use of walking/hiking trails within the county” and Economic Development Goal 1 “to maintain a robust and sustainable tourism destination”. Finally, the Forest Service goal “to collaborate with others, including consulting and partnering with Cherokee tribes to identify and preserve special tribal areas and natural resources” was consistent with Jackson County’s Natural Resources Goal 2 “to create partnerships with the Eastern Band of the Cherokee Indians, Western Carolina University, etc.”

The Highland Domes geographic area included much of Southern Jackson County encompassing the Cashiers and Sapphire communities. Much of the Highland Domes area were known for the landscape of broad valleys, wild rivers, 300 cliffs and high granitic domes. Some familiar geographic features in the Highland Domes area were Yellow Mountain, Terrapin Mountain, Blackrock Mountain, Whiteside Mountain and Panthertown Valley.

Informational item.

(4) UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE: Mr. Poston stated they had discussed previously the creation of a Unified Development Ordinance (UDO). Staff put out a Request for Proposals (RFP) to help create a UDO, which would be combining 21 development ordinances into one framework document. They received back three responses to the RFP, interviewed all three and selected Stewart, who would also partner with J.M. Teague.

Chad Surry of Stewart, presented the Unified Development Ordinance Project Kickoff:

- (a) Project Background: April – August 2017:**
 - County embarks on UDO Process
 - Adoption of Comprehensive Plan
 - Stewart engaged for UDO preparation
 - Project initiation / kickoff
- (b) Work Program and Phases**
 - Phase 1: Project Initiation and kickoff
 - Phase 2: Assessment report
 - Phase 3: Draft UDO
 - Phase 4: Public review and adoption
- (c) Project initiation:**
 - Review existing ordinances and Comprehensive Plan
 - Staff and stakeholder interviews
 - Reconnaissance of county
 - Public involvement:
 - Planning Board/Councils
 - Board of Commissioners
 - Press releases and regular project updates
 - Website
- (d) Assessment Report:**
 - Diagnosis:
 - Identify key issues
 - Analyze current regulations
 - Summarize best practices and recommend
 - Annotated Outline: Outline new UDO structure
 - Public meetings

- (e) Draft UDO:
 - Outline as guide
 - Installments:
 - Code layout/formatting
 - Transfer existing text
 - Draft by similar category
 - Staff/Advisory Committee review
 - Public review/comments
- (f) Public Review and Adoption:
 - Revision and consolidation of installments into single draft
 - Provide recommendation on future amendments
 - Public meeting
 - Public hearing
 - Final UDO revisions and adoption
- (g) Existing Ordinances:
 - 21 separate ordinances
 - Need for standardization
 - Consistent/consolidated development processes
 - Remove inconsistencies
 - Definition conflicts
 - Need of new and updated graphics/illustrations
 - General Statute consistency
 - Basic lack of user-friendliness
- (h) What was a UDO?
 - Combines subdivision regulations, development standard, environmental regulations, etc. into one, easy-to-read reference document.
 - Intended to eliminate redundant or conflicting code provisions, help streamline the review and approval process and clarify the steps and requirements with clear illustrations and language.
- (i) User-friendliness, organization:
 - Flow charts for processes
 - Use of tables and graphics (flow chart, table, illustrations)
 - Grouping of similar topics
 - Clear definitions
 - Consolidated review standards
 - Consistency
- (j) Status:
 - This project was just beginning and they had not formed any recommendations yet.
 - They were collecting information and beginning research.
 - It was a challenging task to update all of the information and reorganize it in a user-friendly format.

Informational item.

(5) LOCAL GOVERNMENT WORKPLACE PROJECT EMPLOYEE SURVEY:

Danielle Wittekind, Human Resource Director presented: Local Government Workplaces Project Employee Survey Roundup Overview:

(a) Local Government Workplaces Project:

- UNC-SOG Initiative
- Mission: improve NC local government workplaces through cost-effective organizational research
- Generate comparison data across NC
- International network of public management scholars

(b) Why survey employees:

- Take the temperature of the organization
- Give employees voice
- Gauge receptivity to policy changes
- Assess morale
- Estimate demand for benefits/services

(c) Employee Survey Roundup:

- Fixed internet survey
- Multiple Organizations

(d) Process:

- Advanced communication with employees
- Confidentiality
- Alert email week prior from upper management
- Personalized links
- Several follow-ups
- 70% response rate

(e) Survey Topics:

- Employee satisfaction with pay/benefits, recognition, rewards, technology, innovation
- Job satisfaction
- Turnover intentions
- Employee voice
- Structure (hierarchy, centralization, rules)
- Organizational silence
- Organizational structure
- Communications
- Resources
- Supervisory Practices
- Teamwork
- Trust
- Workplace civility

(f) Next Steps

- For interested parties, sign service agreement, provide employee list
- Obtain UNC-IRB approval
- Promote survey participation
- Administer survey
- Generate reports
- Free one-hour consultation by conference call with participants
- Consultant references

(g) Employee List Fields Needed:

- First Name

- Last Name
 - Gender or Salutation
 - Race/Ethnicity
 - Department of Division
 - Email
 - Title, Department Heads and Supervisors
 - Tenure
 - Age
- (h) Timeline:
- July 15th – signed service agreements due
 - August 1st – employee lists due
 - August 15th – September 15th Survey launch
 - Two/three week survey window
 - Deliverables no later than October
- (i) Pricing: \$2,500
- (j) Deliverables:
- Interactive online survey results platform that provides access to:
 - Distributions of results across organization
 - Comparisons of percentage responses by department
 - Ability to isolate specific departmental results
 - Comparison with other organizations on select measures
 - Comments by departments (>5)

Informational item.

(6) PERSONNEL POLICY UPDATE: Ms. Wittekind presented: Human Resources Manual Concerns and Discussion Points:

- (a) General:
- Human Resources Manual (Personnel Policy) adopted as policy and not ordinance. Allows the ability to update by section as needed in the future.
 - The goal was to adopt policy as a starting point and to identify a process to make future modifications as warranted by drafting revisions internally for Board of County Commissioners for approval.
 - Voluntary Shared Leave Policy was currently stand-alone policy and could be included.
 - Not defined or addressed in the policy but need to discuss if there was a need for:
 - Telecommunicating Policy
 - Social Media Policy
- (b) Article I. Organization of Human Resources System:
- Coverage – different policies apply to different departments/offices.
 - Responsibilities of Board of County Commissioners, County Manager and Human Resources Director regarding policy, hiring authority, disciplinary action, etc.
- (c) Article II. The Position Classification Plan:
- Discussion Annual Adoption with Approved Budget
 - Section 3. Administration – Rewritten to include County Manager involvement.
- (d) Article III. The Pay Plan:
- Discuss Annual Adoption with Approved Budget – inclusive of ranges and grades/steps.
 - Governing pay policies will be identified in approved fiscal year budget (i.e. year one of career path date reinstatement, next year – year two of career path date reinstatement) providing guidelines for hiring above minimum based on comparable experience in comparable jurisdiction.

- County Manager to approve salary above minimum in accordance with pay policies adopted by Board of County Commissioners.
 - Removal of merit increase section.
 - Adjust the promotion section to increase from 5% to 10%. This section would be revised in 2018 after full implementation of career path step to address career path date being used to determine appropriate step promotion.
 - Consolidate reclassification definitions and administration of salaries when reclassified.
 - Salary Adjustment Date – Change to beginning of new pay cycle, not actual date.
- (e) Article IV. Recruitment and Selection:
- County approved application rather than State Application.
 - Residency Requirement
 - Transfer Probationary Period
- (f) Article V. Conditions of Employment
- Expansion of Unlawful Workplace Harassment
 - Addition of Workplace Violence
 - Random Drug Screening for Safety Sensitive Positions
- (g) Article VI. Holidays and Leave.
- Vacation in Excess of 2 Weeks – Change Approval to County Manager
- (h) Article VII. Employee Benefits:
- Updated to match current plans and offerings
- (i) Article VIII. Separation, Disciplinary Action and Reinstatement:
- Examples of unsatisfactory job performance
 - Investigatory suspension with pay granted by County Manager initially
 - Reinstatement – service and sick leave reinstate
- (j) Article IX. Grievance Procedures:
- Personnel Board
 - New procedure of vertical complaint/appeal filing:
 - Supervisor, 5 business days
 - Department Head, 5 business days
 - Human Resources, 5 business days
 - County Manager, 10 business days
 - BOCC, 30 calendar days – issues final decision, does not have to have face-to-face hearing
- (k) Article X. Personnel Records:
- Updated with correct language from G.S.
- (l) Appendix
Informational item.

(7) GATED COMMUNITY ORDINANCE: Mr. Adams stated he received a request for a Gated Communities Ordinance. He requested that Michael Forbis, Fire Marshal respond, which he did so in an email dated August 1st:

Mr. Forbis' email stated that although the County Emergency Services occasionally run into issues regarding located gates, he was not aware of any discussions on the need for such an ordinance.

Jackson County Code of Ordinances Chapter 28, Section 28-62 (1)(b) stated that regardless of the designation of the road, every lot shall have access to road that was sufficient to provide a means of ingress and egress for emergency vehicles as well as all those likely to need or desire access to the property for its intended use. This section refers to the ingress and egress of emergency vehicles. As long as a road was not fully blocked with some form of immovable barricade it was sufficient for the access of emergency vehicles.

The 2012 North Carolina Fire Prevention Code designates the approval of gates and barricades across fire apparatus access roads to the fire chief. County chiefs do a great job of keeping their respective departments informed of situations like this. If there was ever an emergency situation, where access was not readily accessible, the responders may gain access by whatever means they deem necessary at that time.

Mr. Adams recommended this item be an Emergency Services driven conversation because Emergency Services would need to be behind the ordinance.

Consensus: *The Board agreed that Mr. Adams should respond to the request stating that the issue should be an Emergency Services driven issue.*

(8) PARRIS CABIN: Mr. Adams stated he received a summary from Victor Lofquist, Engineer/President, Lofquist and Associates, regarding the preliminary plan for the John Parris Cabin Site and their recent discussions with the downhill adjoining property owner, Todd Sylvester.

As described during their onsite meeting, a potential alternate to initially building the wall with the associated fencing, grading and piped drainage network, would be to stabilize the area where the wall failed and provide a suitable landscape buffer between the cabin and the downhill neighbor. This alternative would involve removing the wall rubble from the neighbor's property, excavating and removing earth material beginning downslope along the toe of the failed wall and excavating in an upslope direction at a 2 horizontal to 1 vertical inclination towards the "flat" portion of the Parris Cabin yard. The excavated material would need to be trucked off site and properly disposed of. Excavating and reshaping this part of the embankment would lessen the east/west width of the cabin "flat" yard area by an estimated nine feet, more or less. Once cleanup was completed and the embankment was graded, then a tree and shrub landscape buffer could be planted along the contour of the new slope, extending from the fence just south of the cabin and continuing to the north to connect with the shrub hedge on the Sylvester property near the northeast corner of the Parris Cabin land tract. Staggered plantings of selected plant species in a ten feet or wider landscape buffer, could provide a thick privacy barrier for both the county and Sylvester properties. When grown in, this landscape buffer would help to control runoff and would also help to provide protection against surface erosion along the embankment in the vicinity of the landscape plantings.

If rainwater runoff from the site was allowed to remain un-concentrated and was conveyed as sheet drainage, then the rate of runoff from the Parris Cabin tract should be no more than it had been at any time in the past. Being unaware of any current drainage issues of significance, they did not foresee an immediate need to install a piped storm drain system under this alternative stabilization scenario. However, if rainwater run-off becomes a concern at some time in the future, then piped drainage system could certainly be added at a later date.

Before proceeding with any work on site, they recommend having a geotechnical engineer conduct an initial site evaluation to obtain their recommendations regarding earthwork and determine if further soils testing and evaluations were recommended by the geotechnical engineer. Immediately after the meeting last week, they contacted Kessel Engineering group and requested a proposal on the county's behalf to conduct an initial preliminary site soil evaluation. They would forward the Kessel proposal for review when available.

Constructing the wall and fence certainly remain an option, but the alternate described herein may be worth considering as an intermediate state of development until ideas for the future use(s) of the Parris cabin site were finalized. The wall, fencing drainage improvements, ADA access and other improvements could be made at a later date or even as a phased improvement approached, on an as-needed basis.

Consensus: *The Board agreed to proceed forward with the alternate option as described.*

(9) COUNTY MANAGER REVIEW PROCESS: Mr. Adams stated that Section 16 Performance Evaluation of the Contract of Employment with the County Manager stated:

Employer shall annually review the performance of the Employee subject to a process, form, criteria and format for the evaluations which shall be mutually agreed upon by the Employer and Employee. The process, at a minimum shall include the opportunity for both parties to:

- Prepare a written evaluation

- Meet and discuss the evaluation
- Present a written summary of the evaluation results. The final written evaluation should be completed and delivered to the Employee within thirty days of the evaluation meeting.

Chairman McMahan stated that previously, there was no formal evaluation process. The previous Board thought it was very valuable to have a performance evaluation, which was standard across the state for city and county managers.

He attended a School of Government training on manager evaluations, which stated the need for them and the positive benefits of doing evaluations. It would give them an opportunity to evaluate the manager's performance and give feedback to start a dialogue between the manager and the Board. There were statutory requirements, contractual requirements and the job description. Since it was approaching Mr. Adams' one year anniversary of coming to the county, so he thought it was time to start the conversation.

The next step would be for the Board to take the evaluation sheets with them to complete and then the Board would meet back in closed session to discuss.

Informational item.

(10) UPCOMING MEETINGS: Chairman McMahan reviewed the list of upcoming meetings:

- August 28 at 5:50 Public Hearing – Cullowhee
- August 28 at 5:55 Public Hearing – Cashiers
- August 28 at 6:00 Regular Meeting
- September 11 at 3:00 Regular Meeting
- September 12 at 1:00 Work Session
- September 18 at 6:00 Regular Meeting – move location to the Tuckasegee VFW Building
- October 2 at 3:00 Regular Meeting cancelled and moved to October 9 at 3:00

Informational item.

(11) HEALTH DEPARTMENT FACILITIES: Mr. Adams stated he had been back in contact with Evergreen and although it was not definite, it appeared that Vaya intended to be out of the building by June, 2018. The square footage of the building was 20,800 and the current space the health department was currently in contained 29,000 square feet. It would be difficult to determine if the space could be programmed to fit the needs of the Health Department, even if Environmental Health was removed from the equation, which currently utilized less than 5,000 square feet. If the Board intended to proceed with the leasing conversation, it would need to be done with the understanding that the square footage was less than the health department programming.

Also, the administrative portion of the health department would fit into the building as it was an administrative building, but in terms of the clinical space needed, it would be a significant remodel. To truly know if the space would work for all of the programming and flow, they would need a more formalized process with an architect to evaluate the space to see what it would take to operate the clinical portion.

Commissioner Deitz stated he thought they should try to remodel the current building.

Chairman McMahan stated that based on this information, from a space standpoint, the building fell well short of what they were told by the architect that was needed for programming as there were significant challenges to the structure of the building and would require major overhaul renovations. Also, he was not in favor of leasing and he did not want to pay for another study to determine if the space could be reprogrammed to fit. He thought this option was off the table and that they were back to the point of making a decision of whether to remodel the existing facility or build a new facility.

Commissioner Mau stated that based on being that short of square footage, he had a tough time trying to figure out how it would work. But, thought it may be worth calling Ron Smith to see if he would be willing to let them know if he thought it may work, without doing a complete study.

Commissioner Luker stated he thought it was worth having a conversation with Ron Smith. They could even think about reserving it for other departments that may need the additional space such as WIC and DSS.

Mr. Adams stated that another scenario would be to possibly use the space on a temporary basis for the Health Department or other departments in the future.

Commissioner Elders stated he wanted to keep this option in mind, but he thought they should study remodeling the current building.

Commissioner Deitz stated he agreed with Commissioner Elders.

Consensus: *Contact Ron Smith, who did the programming study for the health department and ask him to take a look at the schematics to see if it would be feasible to move the health department into the space. Set a special meeting on August 28th at 4:00 to further discuss this item.*

(12) **AGENDAS**: Commissioner Luker suggested that a section be added to the agendas for “old business” for unresolved items.

Mr. Adams stated he could add that as an attachment as a running agenda item.
Informational item.

There being no further business, Commissioner Deitz moved to adjourn the meeting. Commissioner Elders seconded the Motion. Motion carried and the meeting adjourned at 5:24 p.m.

Attest:

Approved:

Angela M. Winchester, Clerk to Board

Brian Thomas McMahan, Chairman