

**MINUTES
TRANSYLVANIA COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
October 10, 2017 – REGULAR MEETING**

The Board of Commissioners of Transylvania County met in regular session on Tuesday, October 10, 2017 at 9:00 a.m. in Commissioners Chambers at the County Administration Building, located at 101 S. Broad Street, Brevard, NC.

Commissioners present were Chairman Larry Chapman, Jason Chappell, Mike Hawkins, and Vice-Chairwoman Page Lemel. Commissioner Kelvin Phillips was absent due to illness. Also present were County Manager Jaime Laughter, County Attorney Misti Bass, and Clerk to the Board Trisha Hogan.

Media: *The Transylvania Times* – Derek McKissock

There were approximately 30 people in the audience.

CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Larry Chapman presiding declared a quorum was present and called the meeting to order at 9:02 a.m.

WELCOME

Chairman Chapman welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked the members of the public for participating in their local government. He introduced Commissioners and staff in attendance.

PUBLIC HEARING

SECTION 5311 ADMINISTRATIVE & CAPITAL PROGRAM AND SECTION 5310 OPERATING PROGRAM FOR FY 2019

Transportation Coordinator April Alm presented an overview of the funding being requested for the Transylvania County Transportation Department.

FY 2019 5311 Administrative:

The Section 5311 grant program is apportioned to individual counties based on a formula that considers factors such as land area, population, population growth rates, vehicle miles and the number of low-income individuals. In North Carolina, the Section 5311 grant subsidizes the administrative costs of running a transportation system, allowing communities to focus their resources predominantly on operations.

In this application, Transylvania County intends to request a total of \$163,691 in support for the administrative expenditures of its transit program. This requires a County match of \$24,555 (15%) of the total. The funds will cover the salary and wage and fringe benefits of the Transportation Department's one full-time employee and four part-time employees. This represents a 5.3% decrease from the FY 2018 application due to the retirement of two long time employees and the subsequent restructuring of the department, thus resulting in the request for a smaller appropriation for FY 2019.

FY 2019 5311 Capital Program:

The Section 5311 grant program also provides funding to maintain the fleet of publicly supported transit vehicles and other capital needs. The Transportation Department would like to request \$123,310 in capital funding, \$120,000 of which is for the replacement of two vehicles in its fleet. The two vehicles eligible for replacement through this program are:

1. 2006 Ford Transit Van, equipped with wheelchair lift, 175,074 miles
2. 2011 Ford Champion Van, equipped with wheelchair lift, 147,082 miles

The request also includes \$3,310 in funding for the replacement of some office furniture and cellphones to equip the vans for communicating with the transit operators as occasionally they move out of the range of the radio system with which the vans are currently equipped. This application will require the County to commit to a local match of \$12,331 (10%) of the total program.

FY 2019 5310 Operating Program:

This is the only application new to Transylvania County Transportation. Section 5310 grants are a separate funding stream that states can use to assist nonprofit groups in meeting the transportation needs of older adults and people with disabilities when transportation services provided are unavailable, insufficient or inappropriate to meeting these needs.

The County currently budgets \$52,000 for the purchase of rides through local private operators. Transportation staff hopes to utilize local nonprofits to make referrals to this service and use the large expansion of funding that a 5310 grant would provide to restore out-of-County transportation to the elderly and disabled.

Voluntary Surveys

Ms. Alm invited the public to complete two voluntary surveys that she had placed on a table at the entrance to Commissioners Chambers. The first survey was the Title VI Public Involvement form. The second survey was for the proposed FY 2019 grant applications. She had provided budget summaries for each program application for the public's review as well.

Overview of the Total Financial Impact:

<u>Project</u>	<u>Total Amount</u>	<u>Local Share</u>
5311 Administrative	\$163,691	\$24,555
5311 Capital	\$123,310	\$12,331
5310 Operating	\$104,000	\$52,000
Total Project	\$391,001	\$88,886

A public hearing is required to make application. This item is also under New Business for action by the Board.

Chairman Chapman declared the public hearing open at 9:07 a.m. There was no input from the public. **Chairman Chapman declared the public hearing open at 9:07 a.m.**

PUBLIC COMMENT

There were no comments from the public.

AGENDA MODIFICATIONS

There were no agenda modifications from staff or Commissioners.

Commissioner Lemel moved to approve the agenda as presented, seconded by Commissioner Hawkins and unanimously approved.

CONSENT AGENDA

Commissioner Lemel moved to approve the Consent Agenda, seconded by Commissioner Hawkins and unanimously approved.

The following items were approved:

MINUTES

The Board of Commissioners met in special session on September 19, 2017. This meeting was in place of the regular meeting that was cancelled on Tuesday, September 12 due to the remnants to Hurricane Irma. Following, the Commissioners met in closed session in which the minutes were sealed. The Board of Commissioners met in regular session on Monday, September 25, 2017. The minutes from both meetings were approved as submitted.

AN ORDINANCE DECLARING A ROAD CLOSURE FOR THE VETERANS DAY CEREMONY

North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) Special Event Guidelines stipulates that counties shall pass an ordinance declaring a road closure for a special event. The purpose is so NCDOT can review for conflicts and concerns, and is neither approving nor denying the event. The Clerk has submitted the special use permit application to the City of Brevard to close a portion of Main Street on November 10 for the Veterans Day Ceremony at the Courthouse Gazebo. Commissioners approved “An Ordinance Declaring a Road Closure for the Veterans Day Ceremony” which is hereby incorporated by reference and made a part of these minutes and instructed the Clerk to send the document along with a cover letter to the NCDOT Highway Division 14 office.

PROCLAMATION DECLARING OCTOBER AS DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

SAFE, Inc. of Transylvania County requested the Board of Commissioners approve a proclamation declaring the month of October as Domestic Violence Awareness Month and that the proclamation be read aloud during a regular meeting of the Board. Commissioner Lemel read aloud the proclamation. Jill Beach and Wendy Jefferson were in attendance to accept the proclamation along with several other SAFE employees and board members. SAFE, Inc. has planned several events for the month of October to bring awareness and prevent future domestic violence in the community. Commissioners approved Proclamation 28-2017 Declaring October as Domestic Violence Awareness Month which is hereby incorporated by reference and made a part of these minutes.

PROCLAMATION-NATIONAL FAMILY CAREGIVERS MONTH

Carol McLimans is a Family Caregiver Specialist with Land of Sky Regional Council. She requested Commissioners approve a proclamation recognizing November as National Family Caregivers Month, this year’s theme being “Caregiving Around the Clock”. Commissioner Chappell read aloud the proclamation. Ms. McLimans was in attendance to accept the proclamation. She announced that Land of Sky Regional Council provides education and resources for family caregivers and will be hosting an event at the Transylvania County Library on November 6 from 2pm-5pm where caregivers can learn about resources available to them, ways to take care of themselves, and have opportunities to meet other caregivers as well. Commissioners approved Proclamation 31-2017 National Family Caregivers Month which is hereby incorporated by reference and made a part of these minutes.

PRESENTATIONS/RECOGNITIONS

MOSELEY ARCHITECTS-REVIEW OF OPTIONS FOR COURTHOUSE

At the request of Commissioners, Dan Mace with Moseley Architects provided a review of the options available to them for courthouse expansion. There were no changes since his last presentation in 2015, except for the costs associated with each option. This is a summary of his presentation:

Issues with Current Facilities

- Inadequate parking – no separation of Judge, public and staff parking
- No ability to securely transport and move prisoners into the facility
- Aging infrastructure
- Not enough courtrooms for increased caseloads
- Inadequate public screening and queuing spaces
- Mixed movement paths for judges, public and prisoners – safety and liability concerns
- Varied security and accessibility issues
- Inadequate prisoner holding areas
- No jury pool space
- Inadequate court jury deliberation space
- Inadequate courtroom size other than superior courtroom
- Inadequate conference and attorney breakout space

Timeline/Overview

- 2008 – Original Courthouse Feasibility Study
 - Note: 2008 Recession caused Board of Commissioners to put any expansion on hold
 - Study revealed phenomenal growth
 - Recommendation was to build replacement facility at Public Safety Facility campus, 81,000 sq. ft. with potential connector to facility for prisoner transport– approximately \$30 million
 - Also provided downtown alternative of expanding at current site adjacent to current Courthouse; did not address parking; parking structure would be required
- 2013 – Downtown Courthouse Expansion Study
 - Determined smaller facility would be adequate for 15-20 years
 - 34,000 sq. ft. new addition to historic Courthouse, 1,600 sq. ft. renovation – approximately \$12 million
 - No new parking
 - New space to accommodate Adult and Juvenile Corrections, Public Defender, Court Security, etc.
 - Included addition of two courtrooms
 - Note: no ability to match architecture of current Courthouse; deemed undesirable given what it would do visually to the facility
- 2015 – Replacement Courthouse Study
 - Updated program with only essential courthouse spaces at Public Safety Facility site
 - 61,000 sq. ft. – approximately \$22 million
 - Total project cost, not just bricks and mortar; these are not-to-exceed figures
 - Included four courtrooms and all the associative functions
 - Potential to add upper third floor shell to accommodate future expansion increased cost to just over \$26 million
 - New diagram moved facility closer to Public Safety Facility and created separate staff and public parking
 - Layout of proposed diagram controls public and staff movement throughout the facility to provide safety and security for all
 - Several schematic designs offered for visual purposes
- 2017 – Replacement Courthouse Study Cost Update
 - Updated the 2015 Study utilizing current construction cost data
 - 61,000 sq. ft. – approximately \$26 million
 - Construction costs have increased significantly over the last six months; approximately 8% is the current trend
 - Upper third floor shell increases cost to slightly above \$31 million

Decision Matrix Analysis – 2008 Study

Pros	Cons
Purpose-designed for 21 st Century courts	Moves current court location from downtown
Close proximity to detention facility/Sheriff	Most expensive option
Adequate proper and separate parking areas	
Is a “build-out” solution to last 50+ years	
Better security and public accessibility	
Will repair current site drainage issues	

Decision Matrix Analysis – 2013 Study

Pros	Cons
Keeps existing historic court location	Provides only a 15-year need
Less expensive than other two options	Does not improve existing parking issues-actually reduces the existing number
Reason to keep historic building open	A large expansion will negatively affect historic Courthouse appearance
Provides for public toilets for afterhours use	During renovation, unknown latent issues may be discovered needing repair
	Does not have ideal layout given use of existing Courthouse
	Front door is hidden to the rear

Decision Matric Analysis – 2015 Study

Pros	Cons
Purpose-designed for 21 st Century courts	Moves current court location from downtown
Close proximity to detention facility/Sheriff	Costs more than the 2013 study addition
Adequate proper and separate parking areas	
Expansion capability for future growth	
Less expensive than 2008 needs study	
Better security and public accessibility	
Will repair current site drainage issues	

This concluded Mr. Mace’s presentation. Chairman Chapman called for questions and/or discussion by Commissioners. This is a summary:

Q. In terms of addressing the potential needs for a 50-year building, is the upper third floor shell a necessary part of that or is a two-story building sufficient to address the needs for that period of time?

A. It is much easier to understand and predict caseloads over a 15-20 year period, but much harder to predict what may occur in 50 years. In terms of planning, it is appropriate to determine how a building could be expanded if needed and plan accordingly. The shell option is the most efficient option to accommodate expansion. It is not wise planning to design a structure to add a floor at a later time because typically building codes change over time. Horizontal expansion is possible, but it would require new movement paths for the public and staff. If Commissioners decide to include the upper third shell it would be paid for in today’s dollars for easier built-in expansion when needed. At minimum, Commissioners should master plan for the expansion and construct it when needed. (Note: The Social Services Building was constructed with an upper third floor shell which sat vacant for a few years, but it was a critical part of the Health Department expansion.)

Q. Assuming the Board decides upon either the downtown Courthouse expansion or new construction on Morris Road, what does the timeline look like from start to finish?

A. Moseley Architects would start the full schematic design process. The design process to prepare the bidding documents for construction would take approximately 10 months. The bidding process takes

two months (advertisements, receive bids, make recommendations, enter into contracts). The earliest date for construction would be in early 2019. The construction period for a project of this magnitude is expected to be 18-20 months. Once construction is complete, there should be a transition period for furnishing and equipping and moving offices which could take up to 90 days.

Q. Are there any major issues with the Morris Road site (land, soil, etc.)?

A. There have been issues with the drainage at the site. Any new construction there would mitigate any previous problems and improve those issues.

Q. What does Moseley Architects need from Commissioners other than a decision on an option?

A. Moseley Architects is ready to proceed upon the Board's direction. Moseley is prepared to work within the figures they provided. The design process includes several phases (schematic design, design development, construction document) before going to the bid phase. Moseley would complete detailed estimates at each of those time frames so that Commissioners are well informed of where the construction market is at that time. Moseley Architects fully expects the figures provided today to drop as the project becomes more detailed. The figures are conservative planning numbers.

Q. Moseley Architects did not provide the updated 2017 figures on the downtown option. With a parking structure would the downtown option be estimated at \$18-19 million?

A. The parking structure figures have not been updated. The latest trend is \$18,000 per space for a structure with approximately 150 vehicles. The least expensive way to solve parking issues is with surface parking.

Commissioners thanked Mr. Mace for his presentation and for the work he has done on these studies over the years. They intend to be in contact with him in the near future.

The Manager will ensure Mr. Mace's presentations are posted online for public viewing.

FINANCING SCENARIOS-COURTHOUSE

At the request of Commissioners, Finance Director Gay Poor presented financing options available should they decide to move forward with one of the Courthouse expansion projects. When Commissioners last discussed options, the estimated cost to renovate the existing Courthouse and build an annex and a parking deck downtown was \$16 million and the option to construct a new building near the Public Safety Facility on the Morris Road property was estimated at \$22 million. The figures she will be presenting are based on these estimates and the additional option to include an upper third floor shell at \$26 million.

There are four financing methods for consideration with each having pros and cons. They include:

- Installment Financing with a private lender
 - Simplest and lowest cost option
 - Shortest term, generally 10-15 years
- Limited Obligation Bonds (LOBs)
 - Most costly and most complicated
 - Longer term
 - Higher loan amount
- USDA Loan
 - Longer term; 40-year term options
- General Obligation Bonds (GO Bonds)
 - Lowest interest rates at 15-20 year terms
 - Backed by the full faith and credit of the County
 - Lowest risk
 - 20 years is maximum term

The financial information presented in this meeting was based on the interest rates currently available for installment financing agreements and USDA loans. These two methods include, respectively, the shortest and longest terms and the lowest and highest interest rates likely to be offered and, therefore, give a general range for discussion of financing methods. Estimates based on the other two methods will be provided as requested to reflect current rates, which are very fluid now.

Estimated Debt Service for Different Financing Assumptions					
Renovations and Construction of Courthouse Annex and Parking Deck					
Amount Borrowed	\$16,000,000	\$16,000,000	\$16,000,000	\$16,000,000	\$16,000,000
Type of Financing	Installment Purchase	Installment Purchase	Installment Purchase	Installment Purchase	USDA Loan
Term in years	5	10	15	20	40
Interest Rate	2.60%	3.00%	3.25%	3.65%	3.50%
Annual Payment	\$3,453,870	\$1,875,688	\$1,364,617	\$1,141,111	\$749,237
Tax Rate Impact on Current Base	\$0.0605	\$0.0329	\$0.0239	\$0.0200	\$0.0131
% Increase over Current Rate	11.8%	6.4%	4.7%	3.9%	2.6%
Payment over Term of Loan	\$17,269,349	\$18,756,881	\$20,469,259	\$22,822,221	\$29,969,461
Total Payment as % of Amount Borrowed	107.9%	117.2%	127.9%	142.6%	187.3%

Construction of New Courthouse					
Amount Borrowed	\$22,000,000	\$22,000,000	\$22,000,000	\$22,000,000	\$22,000,000
Type of Financing	Installment Purchase	Installment Purchase	Installment Purchase	Installment Purchase	USDA Loan
Term in years	5	10	15	20	40
Interest Rate	2.60%	3.00%	3.25%	3.65%	3.50%
Annual Payment	\$4,749,071	\$2,579,071	\$1,876,349	\$1,569,028	\$1,030,200
Tax Rate Impact on Current Base	\$0.0832	\$0.0452	\$0.0329	\$0.0275	\$0.0180
% Increase over Current Rate	16.3%	8.8%	6.4%	5.4%	3.5%
Payment over Term of Loan	\$23,745,356	\$25,790,711	\$28,145,231	\$31,380,555	\$41,208,008
Total Payment as % of Amount Borrowed	107.9%	117.2%	127.9%	142.6%	187.3%

On the financing options above, Ms. Poor focused on the 10- and 15-year installment financing option and the USDA loan option. If Commissioners consider adding the third floor shell, there would be an increase of up to about \$3 million for the annual debt service at the 10-year option and \$2.2 million for the 15-year option. This would require a tax rate increase of \$0.053 and \$0.039, respectfully. For the USDA loan, the debt service would increase \$1.2 million and would require a \$0.021 tax increase.

This is a summary of the ensuing discussion and questions from Commissioners:

Q. Is there a penalty for prepayment of a USDA loan?

A. Staff is unaware if there is a penalty, but will find out.

Q. Based on the timeline provided by Moseley Architects, the expenditures would not occur for two to three years?

A. Correct. It was noted that the financial situation is fluid due to the fluctuation of interest rates and the expectation of an increase in the tax base.

Q. What is the availability of USDA loans?

A. USDA loans are always subject to the federal budget appropriation. It is currently funded and for planning purposes, the Courthouse project is in their purview. Should Commissioners decide to move forward with this option, staff would proceed with the application process to secure the funding. USDA would guide the County through the process. USDA requires a somewhat different process in that they require a study of need. This could be completed concurrently with the design phases so it should not impact the timeline for project completion.

Q. The projections for the USDA loan are 3.5%. Would this hold over the course of the term?

A. Yes. This is the rate that was announced October 1. It has been 3.25% prior to that date.

Q. What are the next steps in this process?

A. First Commissioners should choose an option and authorize the architects to begin the design phase. Then Commissioners should direct staff to explore the financing options. These steps would run concurrently. There is an expense for the design drawings which can be drawn down from fund balance. Staff would need to engage with the Local Government Commission as well. The decision on how Commissioners want to move forward is most important and ultimately directs staff to start moving forward aggressively and getting the project ready to bid. Barring no delays, Commissioners should expect a three-year timeframe.

Q. There have been no programming changes made. Is staff comfortable moving forward with the former programming?

A. At this point there are no issues; however, there have been some changes recently with juvenile justice laws. The County can still meet the office impacts, but it would be wise for Commissioners to consider the upper third floor option because major changes in the court system can add significant pressure to staffing levels and space needs.

Commissioners were in consensus to add an item to the agenda for the first meeting in November to make a decision on the Courthouse options. Commissioners asked for updated cost figures on the downtown renovation and expansion option.

It was noted that although to some it appears Commissioners have not “done anything”, Commissioners have essentially gained another 10 years of life out of the Courthouse facility.

OLD BUSINESS

CONTRACT RENEWAL WITH TRANSYLVANIA ECONOMIC ALLIANCE

The contract with the Transylvania Economic Alliance expired September 30, 2017. County Commissioner representatives, staff and members of the Alliance met to revise portions of the contract to make sure that documentation and reporting requirements were clearly delineated with reasonable due dates. The new contract changes the prior contract by:

- Establishing the term as an annual commitment to align with the budget process. A program of work and funding request will be submitted during the budget process annually for consideration in the budget.

- Establishing clearer guidelines for semi-annual and annual reports with reasonable deadlines and identifying county staff for submission attention.

The prior extension agreement authorized payment in the first quarter of FY 2018 in the amount of \$125,000. Total requested funding for the entire fiscal year is \$435,000. Commissioners will need to commit an additional \$310,000 upon approval of the contract to complete the funding cycle for the remainder of the fiscal year to be made in three quarterly payments.

Commissioner Lemel moved to approve the contract with the Transylvania Economic Alliance, the Program of Work for FY 18 and funding as presented. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Chappell. Commissioners were thankful for the work that went into revising this contract. It is important that both parties have a level of comfort with the expectations. It is equally important to showcase successes and to be transparent with the public. By moving to an annual contract, Commissioners will be looking for data and measures to indicate what has been done and why it is being done in order to continue funding. It will be up to Commissioners to provide direction on the results they will be looking for. There was some concern that the financial audit for the previous year had yet to be complete, but the understanding is the Alliance has committed to having it completed by the end of the calendar year. Commissioners thanked the Alliance for the work they are doing because they believe it will have a positive impact on the community. **The motion was unanimously approved.**

NEW BUSINESS

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION (ARC) EMERGING OPPORTUNITIES GRANT (WAYFINDING GRANT)

Planning and Community Development Director Mark Burrows presented this item. Transylvania County was successful in acquiring an Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC) Emerging Opportunities grant to support economic strategies that leverage the natural and cultural heritage assets in Appalachian communities. A project was identified with the goal of showcasing the entire County. Many time visitors come here for a particular destination and leave, not realizing there is much more to see and do. A wayfinding project could turn a day visit into a weekend visit.

In partnership with the Transylvania County Tourism and Development Authority (TCTDA), staff developed a request for proposals (RFP) to distribute to potential sign companies. County staff, representatives from TCTDA, and the NC Department of Transportation (NCDOT) have identified potential sites to locate signs and destinations to highlight on the signs. A component of this project will also be working with NCDOT and other sign owners to remove sign clutter. As identified in the RFP, these new signs will be similar to the City of Brevard's wayfinding signs in style and color. The ARC grant is for \$25,000 and the TCTDA is providing the required local match of \$25,000 for total project cost of \$50,000. Commissioners were asked to authorize staff to issue the RFP and select a qualified contractor to design, fabricate and install 7-10 wayfinding signs throughout the County. Mr. Burrows noted that the Town of Rosman also received a grant for signage inside their jurisdiction and this group has engaged them to ensure consistency and non-duplication.

Commissioner Lemel moved to authorize staff to issue the RFP and select a qualified contractor to design, fabricate and install the 7-10 wayfinding signs throughout the County. The motion was seconded by Commissioner Hawkins. Commissioners thanked Mr. Burrows for his work on this project. They also thanked the TCTDA for being flexible with their funding because these dollars have been designated for some time for similar projects that are just now coming to fruition. **The motion was unanimously approved.**

SECTION 5311 ADMINISTRATIVE & CAPITAL PROGRAM AND SECTION 5310 OPERATING PROGRAM FOR FY 2019

A public hearing was held at the beginning of the meeting as required. There was no input from the public. The following chart shows the financial impact of the Section 5311 Administrative and Capital Program and Section 5310 Operating Program grants for FY 2019 that were summarized during the public hearing:

Project	Total Amount	Local Share
5311 Administrative	\$163,691	\$24,555
5311 Capital	\$123,310	\$12,331
5310 Operating	\$104,000	\$52,000
Total Project	\$391,001	\$88,886

At the request of Transportation Coordinator April Alm, former Interim Transportation Director Jonathan Griffin gave a more in-depth overview of the Section 5310 Operating Program grant application because it is a new application for Transylvania County.

Mr. Griffin explained that the Section 5310 is a formula grant to assist with expanding transportation options for seniors and individuals with disabilities. The NC Department of Transportation allows applications to this program for transit systems to facilitate or support nonprofit organizations in purchasing rides for elderly individuals and people with disabilities. As indicated in the chart above, the local share impact is \$52,000. The County already budgets \$52,000 for purchasing subsidized rides through local private operators (Brevard City Cab). In reviewing the data on those the County serves with this program, Mr. Griffin found that $\frac{3}{4}$ of the people receiving rides through this program are considered elderly. The documentation was not clear on how many may be disabled; however, Mr. Griffin feels the number is high. The idea behind this grant is to take the funding already set aside and partner with nonprofits who understand better where the needs are to coordinate referrals to this service, and then double the size of the program using federal matching funds. This will allow the County to restore and expand transportation options to citizens living outside city limits to help them stay independent and maintain some quality of life that they otherwise might not have been able to do. With the addition of federal funds, there is the possibility of restoring out-of-county transports through coordination with nonprofits. This could open up potential opportunities for the County in the future.

Commissioners commended Mr. Griffin and Ms. Alm on their work and for looking for creative solutions to some very complex transportation issues, particularly for the elderly and disabled.

Commissioner Lemel moved to approve the grant process for the Transportation Department for the Section 5310 and 5311 applications as presented, seconded by Commissioner Hawkins and unanimously approved.

NATIONAL FITNESS CAMPAIGN (NFC)

Parks and Recreation Director Carleen Dixon reported that the National Fitness Campaign (NFC) reached out to her with an expressed interest in our community. The NFC researched communities across the country searching for 100 communities that met the parameters for their 2018 campaign. Those communities had to be active communities that showed fitness as a priority and had an ideal setting for a fitness court with the ability to install it in 2018.

Ms. Dixon felt the fitness court concept was very similar to the fitness area she supported and sought grant funding for in 2016. The County was not awarded the grant funding for this project. The fitness

court could be located in South Broad Park as planned for the original project and it would meet needs in the community as expressed in the original proposal. Ms. Dixon reported this time there would be two new partners willing to assist with a financial campaign to fund the project: Brevard High School Senior, Kaine McAlister and National Fitness Campaign/Fit Radio. She noted this project proposal does not include improvements to South Broad Park that were part of the previous proposal.

The financial impact of this project is as follows:

- Total construction: \$110,250
 - Concrete pad: \$15,000
 - Fitness court: \$90,000
 - Contingency: \$5,250
- Funding proposed
 - City of Brevard: \$15,000 (concrete pad construction)
 - Fit Radio grant: \$10,000 + in kind marketing
 - Fundraising from community: \$20,000 (to be raised)
 - Transylvania County: Property (in-kind + \$65,250)

The pros and cons presented with the 2016 project proposal are the same with this proposal:

Pros:

1. Provides most benefit to teens and adults (fitness area)
2. Access to free fitness area for all citizens most of the year
3. Addresses one of the top three health concerns in our County as identified in the 2015 County Health Assessment
4. Project supports Parks and Recreation Master Plan
 - a. #1 Most Needed Programs: Adult Fitness and Wellness
 - b. #1 Most Important to Households: Adult Fitness and Wellness

Cons:

1. Restroom access limited (Library restrooms during open hours; need to explore portable toilet or other options)
2. Fitness area is near road; unsure if barrier is enough to provide adequate safety
3. Will require supervision/assistance for people with certain limitations
4. Does not provide year round fitness access due to weather
5. Could limit future expansion of the Library
6. Concerns about location in downtown and if this is the appropriate place or the highest and best use of the site; green space and current site for events like Family Splash Day
7. Close to Kinetic Fish Sculpture, but should not impact
8. Parking concerns
9. If not properly maintained, could become an eyesore
10. Not listed on the capital improvement list in the Parks and Recreation Master Plan (listed as priority of providing adult fitness and wellness opportunities on the programming side)

Ms. Dixon reported that the Parks and Recreation Commission has reviewed and discussed this project and at their August meeting agreed they would like to see Commissioners support and fund this project through monies set aside in the Parks and Recreation Master Plan reserves.

Ms. Dixon asked Commissioners to consider the following recommendations:

1. Support action to seek out the Fit Radio grant of \$10,000 through the National Fitness Campaign to become 1 of 100 locations where a fitness court will be installed in 2018;

2. Support staff in partnership with Kaine McAlister, Senior at Brevard High School, to start a fundraising campaign to raise \$20,000 to go toward the fitness court;
3. Fund the remaining amount that is needed to implement this project out of the funds set aside for the Parks & Recreation Master Plan work: \$65,250.

This concluded the presentation. This is a summary of the questions and comments:

Q. What is plan for funding the project if the fundraising campaign is not achieved? Is it the expectation that the County would fund the remainder or that the project would not move forward?

A. Based on the soft commitments Ms. Dixon has received, she does not anticipate there being an issue with raising the necessary funding and potentially additional funding. However, if the money is not raised, there is nothing requiring the Board to move forward with the project. On another note, should the project move forward, there is no commitment to the location for the long term.

Q. Did the Library Board of Trustees provide input on this project?

A. The previous project was reviewed by the Library Board of Trustees. The parking and restrooms were their major concerns and those issues remain a concern.

Q. What are ongoing costs expected to be?

A. The equipment is very sustainable to weather and is constructed to be outside. Ongoing costs would be clean up (trash, mowing) which the department does now. A portable toilet costs about \$150/month.

Q. With the approval of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan, the Board of Commissioners has identified substantial major capital projects. There is concern about using the funds set aside for larger projects for smaller projects like this fitness park. At what point is the Parks and Recreation Commission going to be identifying the stages of reaching the goals of the Master Plan and bringing recommendations back to the Board of Commissioners?

A. Ms. Dixon stated that the Parks and Recreation Commission understands there are long term needs to be addressed, but they have been looking at ways to address needs in the short term as well. They also hope this project will build some momentum and interest in parks and recreation activities.

Q. This project seems to fit in more of an urban setting. It is more of an amenity than a destination. Some of the larger projects included in the Parks and Recreation Master Plan are destination-type projects. Is this a correct assumption?

A. The fitness park is a standalone outside gym that anyone can access for free and can be an amenity or a destination depending on the user.

The Board took no action.

MANAGER'S REPORT

The Manager reported the following:

- Community invited to Quebec Community Club 50th Anniversary drop in on October 15 from 1:30pm-5pm
- NC Library Conference October 18; Director Anna Yount will be presenting the strategic plan process they went through; Manager will be joining her to help explain how their work ties back into the County's strategic plan
- Hosting Crib to Career Workshop October 11 from 12pm-2pm at Elections Center; project of the Institute of Emerging Issues to help communities understand how to take on early childhood issues and early learning and how that applies to future workforces

- Involved with CS4WNC project through Land of Sky Regional Council, looking at computational thinking and how communities look at learning to ensure their workforce is prepared for the technology demands and understanding what jobs are requiring
 - Next steps to engage school system and community colleges

PUBLIC COMMENT

Benny Frady: Mr. Frady is the head of court security at the Courthouse and stated that court officers face daily chaos and obstacles in their jobs. He pointed out if Commissioners consider expanding at the current site, that parking would be eliminated during construction and he was unaware of an alternative facility to hold court during that time. He said he has experience in construction and believes it is less expensive to build up than out and therefore supports new construction with the upper third floor shell.

Kristi Brown. Mrs. Brown is the Clerk of Superior Court. She thanked Commissioners for keeping this project on the table, noting that with the help of Commissioners, court staff, maintenance, etc. they have been able to extend the life of the Courthouse by more than 15 years. There remains a space needs issues. Caseloads continue to grow. Although court security does a great job, they do so facing major obstacles every day. The number of people that come through the doors of that facility on a daily basis is vast. Again, she thanked the Board for reviewing this project and offered to take Commissioners on a tour of the facility.

Kristen Gentry: Ms. Gentry spoke on behalf of the Care Coalition. She stated that the Care Coalition is supportive of projects like the fitness park that was proposed by Parks and Recreation because it helps them with their goal of reducing substance abuse among young people in the community. She pointed out that South Broad Park has a reputation for sometimes being a problem area, so she felt it was important to modify areas like this to make them less conducive to drug and alcohol use.

COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

Commissioner Lemel spent two days in Chapel Hill recently. One day was to attend the “Thinking Big for Small People: Why Are NC Leaders So Enthusiastic About Pre-K for 4-Year Olds?”. It was a great conference on early childhood efforts across the State and the potential efforts that could be put forth by local governments. For the other day, she was invited to be a member of the Social Services Working Group that will be looking to establish the protocols and structure of the Social Services Regional Supervision and Collaboration looking to reform the child welfare system and create the regional structure of social services departments. This is a huge opportunity for Transylvania County to participate in this level of discussion.

Chairman Chapman thanked the Transylvania County Military Honor Guard. They were invited by personal request to perform a ceremony at a funeral in Henderson County. Chairman Chapman attended a NC Association of County Commissioners Board of Directors meeting in Dare County. He reported lots of issues going on across the State and this meeting afforded him the opportunity to interact with other County Commissioners. He commended Commissioners Hawkins and Lemel for their work as they are recognized across the State for their efforts in economic development and early childhood, respectfully.

Chairman Chapman moved to enter into closed session per NCGS 143-318.11 (a) (4) to discuss matters relating to the location or expansion of industries or other businesses in the area served by the public body, after a 5 minute recess, seconded by Commissioner Lemel and unanimously carried.

CLOSED SESSION

Pursuant to NCGS 143-318.11 (a) (4) to discuss matters relating to the location or expansion of industries or other businesses in the area served by the public body, closed session was entered into at 11:05 a.m. Present were Chairman Chapman, Commissioners Chappell, Hawkins, and Lemel, County Manager Jaime Laughter, County Attorney Misti Bass, Transylvania Economic Alliance Executive Director Josh Hallingse, and Clerk to the Board Trisha Hogan.

Commissioners received information on a potential economic development project, discussed potential incentives, and instructed staff on how to proceed.

Chairman Chapman moved to leave closed session, seconded by Commissioner Lemel and unanimously carried.

OPEN SESSION

Chairman Chapman moved to seal the minutes of the closed session until such time that opening the minutes does not frustrate the purpose of the closed session, seconded by Commissioner Lemel and unanimously carried.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, **Chairman Chapman moved to adjourn the meeting at 11:30 a.m., seconded by Commissioner Lemel and unanimously carried.**

Larry L. Chapman, Chairman
Transylvania County Board of Commissioners

ATTEST:

Trisha M. Hogan, Clerk to the Board