
REGULAR MEETING
 January 4, 2016
 6:15 p.m.

The Perquimans County Board of Commissioners met in a regular meeting on Monday, January 4, 2016, at 6:15 p.m. in the upstairs Courtroom located on the second floor of the Perquimans County Courthouse Annex.

- | | | |
|------------------|---|---|
| MEMBERS PRESENT: | Janice McKenzie Cole, Chair
Fondella Leigh
Wallace Nelson | Kyle Jones, Vice Chairman
Edward R. Muzzulin
Matthew Peeler |
| MEMBERS ABSENT: | None | |
| OTHERS PRESENT: | Frank Heath, County Manager
Hackney High, County Attorney | Mary Hunnicutt, Clerk to the Board |

After the Chair called the meeting to order, Commissioner Leigh gave the invocation and the Chair led the Pledge of Allegiance. Chair Cole said that the first item of business was to hold a public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING

Administrative Text Amendment No. TXT-15-01

Chair Cole opened the Public Hearing stating that the purpose of the public hearing was to receive citizens' comments to consider Administrative Text Amendment No. TXT-15-01, to revise standards, conditions and procedures for Wind Energy Facilities in the unincorporated County, with proposed changes to the Zoning Ordinance and Fee Schedule. There were 150+ people present. Chair Cole gave instructions regarding speaking to the Board and keeping the meeting moving since there were a number of people who have signed up to speak. Chair Cole recognized Donna Godfrey, County Planner, who explained a few things about the text amendment. Chair Cole said that, in interest of time, she would ask that Ms. Godfrey forego her further comments until later in the meeting. Ms. Cole wanted to proceed with the public comments. The following individuals spoke:

- **Burt Eure**: Mr. Eure, a life time resident and a business owner in Perquimans County, asked the Board to assess the risk of allowing new businesses into the County and encouraged them to abide by their vision statement which was adopted several months ago. He read the following items to the Board: (a) continuation of the present physical appearance and form is important if not critical to the County if it is to maintain its unique character among its jurisdictions and region; (b) limiting commercial development in rural areas; and (c) County must work to educate citizens in the development community with respect to the desired physical appearance. These statements were included in the vision statement that the Board approved a couple of months ago and he is asking that the Board assess the risk to make sure that this development doesn't go against the vision statement. He further stated that this will be the most invasive project that the County has ever had. It has pitted neighbor against neighbor and created animosity between businesses and families. His final question to the Board was, "How could this be good for Perquimans County?"
- **Clyde Elliott**: Mr. Elliott stated that he lives in the Bear Swamp area and that he had built his dream home eight years ago on a 200 acre farm. This property is adjacent to this proposed project on three sides. Two of the three sides are located 400 yards from his house. The only thing separating him from this invasive property is a ditch. The current tower ordinance allows these 600' monstrosities to be erected within 300 yards from his property line and 500 yards from his house. Therefore, it would devalue his property and destroy his way of life. He speaks for 21 family members and over 100 close family and neighbors that are within one mile of this project. He is requesting at a minimum one mile buffer zone. He wants this Board to be known as the Board that would listen to 99% of residents in the Bear Swamp area that wants to protect their homes, their property value, their lands, and their way of life by having this one mile buffer zone. He does not want the Board to be known as the Board that shoved this most invasive project down the throats of the residents of Bear Swamp and the entire Perquimans County community.
- **Tommy Harrell**: Mr. Harrell addressed the following issues regarding the Text Amendment: (a) We need a one mile setback from non-participating property lines; (b) We need protection from noise and shadow flicker; (c) We need a decommissioning bond put in place with the cost determined by an engineer, salvage company, or other expert (because of hazardous materials); (d) We need an escrow account from the applicant (suggest \$50,000) in place until the last one is removed because of unforeseen problems; (e) We need a Real Property Protection Plan in place (the wind energy people say there is no loss in values), if that is true there should be no problem with them signing the agreement; (f) We need the wind turbine owners to have liability insurance in place to protect nonparticipating land owners for the life of the project (at least \$3,000,000); (g) We need environmental assessments by state and federal organizations; they should be listed and include wildlife and soil and water conservation (the wind industry should have to adhere to the same laws as agriculture); (h) We need a road analysis made prior to construction of a project on roads to be used during the construction. At the completion of the project, after inspection, the applicant will reimburse the NCDOT for any road damage; (i) In our existing ordinance, what does materially mean? and (j) What is a major or minor change in the site plan? Please define major and minor. He further asked that the Board put the Health, Safety, and Welfare of the residents of Perquimans County as your top priority in this matter.
- **Mel Atkins**: Mr. Atkins explained that he and his wife retired here because it was a peaceful, scenic area. Since the moratorium public hearing in October, he has done research on wind energy and learned much about it. He also talked to a real estate agent who stated that she had never had anyone to request to purchase a home next to a wind turbine. He has attended many workshops on solar and wind energy to make sure that he would have an objective view. He has walked and driven house to house in the southern portion of Perquimans County and has obtained 99% of signatures from the residents stating that they do not want this project. They are distressed and feel betrayed. Many of them would like to attend the Public Hearing but are busy working to support their families and are unable to attend the meeting. They are very concerned about this just like he is.
- **Craig Craft**: Mr. Craft expressed his concerns regarding how this project would affect aviation. He said that, as a pilot, he wanted the Board to be aware of how this project would be a significant hazard to aviation and would make it difficult to recruit pilots when they are needed which would in turn affect the farmers that need his services. It intensifies the dangers of the job. It is a hazard to the Coast Guard operation, powerline patrol, and to the EMS pilot. He said that he just wanted to make sure the Board was aware of his concerns for the future if this project was allowed to proceed.
- **Jeff Williams**: Mr. Williams owns some farmland in the Bear Swamp area and feels that this project would change the landscape of Perquimans County.
- **Dwayne Proctor**: Mr. Proctor has been a life-long resident of Perquimans County. He has also had the opportunity to visit the Bahamas where they have a lot of wind turbines. He said that they are very loud. Also, as a pilot, he has flown with Mr. Craft to Illinois and saw a wind farm. From 6,000 feet in the air, it is not a pretty sight to see. Perquimans County does not need this project.
- **Tommy Stokely**: Mr. Stokely made the following comment: "My name is Tommy Stokely and I live in Perquimans County in the Bear Swamp Community. My day to day work involves the development of land through the practices of Land Survey and Civil Engineering. I am currently licensed as a Professional Land Surveyor and am pursuing licensure as a Professional Engineer. I wish to go on record and be clear to show my support for my neighbors, family members, and friends that I am against Wind Energy Development in the Bear Swamp Community. I also want to be clear so that everyone here understands that the rejection of Industrial Wind Energy Facilities is not infringing on someone else's property rights. Property owners and developers DO HAVE THE RIGHT TO DEVELOP Industrial Wind towers under the current zoning ordinance. The ordinance is very clear that Industrial Wind Energy Facilities are NOT a USE BY RIGHT. This project falls under the conditional use permit process, and as such, requires the approval of this Board. The conditional use process gives the developer the right to propose a development, not to build it. We, the residents of the Bear Swamp Community, however, have the RIGHT to stand up and oppose it. Likewise, our County Commissioners have the right to reject their proposal. As a developer, Apex understands the risk involved in such a development and they understand they are not guaranteed the approval of this project or any other project they wish to propose. Apex can list the enormous amount of money they have invested to date, and they can threaten to sue, but the bottom line is they were never guaranteed the right to build such a development to start with. So to be clear again: Weyerhaeuser, Apex, and the other nonresident leaseholders are not entitled to the right to build Industrial Energy Facilities on their properties. There are only 6

people who can grant them the right to build Industrial Wind Energy Facilities: they are our elected County Commissioners. We are watching very diligently how well you listen to the people who have entrusted you into the position you now hold. This Board was entrusted with the responsibility to represent the interest of the communities and individuals of Perquimans County. Even if this development meets every aspect set forth in our ordinance, you, our elected officials, have the right to reject this development on our behalf. To be a democratic society, it is imperative that elected officials listen to and represent the interest of the people and their communities.”

- **Alan Lennon:** Mr. Lennon made the following comment: “My name is Alan Lennon. This past December marks 10 wonderful years residing in Perquimans County. In that time my wife, Stephanie, and I have been blessed with 3 beautiful, intelligent, and loving young ladies, Julie, Taylor, and Anna. We have also been blessed by the friendly, welcoming local community, a loving church family, and a calm, peaceful rural environment. The quiet, peaceful, and restful qualities of our area may quickly disappear if legitimate and adequate wind energy facility setbacks are not established. I contacted each member of the Board via e-mail prior to this hearing, in order to provide them with legitimate concerns regarding the way the planning board handled this matter. I also provided the Board numerous documents that support my concerns. We welcome the opportunity to be part of renewable energy development if the citizens and residents of the county are adequately protected from legitimate health and safety concerns. I am representing almost 1000 signatures of county residents and citizens that have requested a 1 mile set back from property line, residences, occupied buildings, and public right of ways. Many other municipalities have 1 mile or greater setbacks. 1 mile is already a compromise. The current law states that noise and shadow flicker for small and medium facilities are addressed by setbacks. So why is noise and shadow flicker for large facilities not addressed by setbacks? 1 mile setbacks will adequately eliminate the concerns regarding noise and shadow flicker concerns. A provision to protect our property values must be address as well. Let’s be realistic, no one is walking into a realtor’s office asking if they have any homes or properties available 1300’ from 500’ tall wind turbines. I can guarantee that not a one of the people speaking in favor of wind energy tonight lives with an Y2 mile of wind turbines, so why should you expect the citizens of our county be subjected to that. We must look at the big picture of the potential long term negative economic and financial impacts that could be associated with inadequate setbacks. I, along with the signed names, live and daily interact in this county. These are our legitimate concerns that must be acknowledge and addressed. I will remind you that this open hearing is to discuss and comment only to the amendments of the text of our county wind energy facility ordinance and nothing else. Comments regarding the economic and/or necessity of renewable energy should be reserved for another occasion, not tonight. I thank you for your time and look forward to your decision to act accordingly on behalf of the petitioning citizens and residents I am representing tonight and amend our law to have 1 mile setbacks which addresses noise and shadow flicker, adequate decommissioning plans, and adequate property value guaranteed provisions. Thank you on behalf of the concerned citizens of Perquimans County.”
- **Patsy Miller:** Ms. Miller made the following comments: She has lived in Perquimans County for 66 years of her 68 years and she raised her children here and now her grandchildren are being raised here. She further stated that she would not do anything that would harm her precious grandchildren. She is a retired Tax Assessor from Currituck County and currently works for Apex Clean Energy. This is her statement not Apex. When she first went to work for Apex, she knew very little about wind energy. She was aware of the small windmills that were on single resident properties because she would have to appraise them in Currituck County. She had to know, had to see, and had to hear. She went to Mt. Storm, WV on her own dollar because she did not want to be prejudiced. She was very fortunate that she talked with a couple of people while she was there. They both told her that they did not have any problems with the wind turbines. They directed her to where she could go to come close to one of the wind turbines. She did not hear noise from the wind mills but did hear the traffic in the distance. In fact, it sounded like the ocean to her. She feels that changing the rules now would be detrimental to not only the company she works for, Apex, but to the property owners that have been able to maximize their income on their property with wind mills. She would never make that statement if there was anything that would be harmful to my children or to my grandchildren. Changing the rules at this time would be unfair. She requests that they keep the 2010 Wind Ordinance as it is.”
- **Alissa Cale:** Ms. Cale made the following comment: Ms. Cale has been attending the Planning Board and Board of Commissioners’ meetings on behalf of Weyerhaeuser regarding the revisions to the 2010 Wind Ordinance. Their property in the Desert Wind Project is about 15% and they own the majority of the property in Perquimans County for the Timbermill Project. There were a lot of comments made that the Desert Wind Farm Project was different from the Timbermill Project because Weyerhaeuser was the major property owner. Proposals to change the Wind Ordinance pursuant to this discussion with greater setbacks than the 2010 Ordinance has been agreed upon by the Planning Board and are being presented tonight for Board consideration. The zoning for the area and the 911 residence maps indicate that the Desert Wind Project and the Timbermill Project are very similar. Changing the ordinance now after it has been approved and utilized by a project that is now under construction impacts their rights as a property owner and discriminates that what was right for multiple owners is not right for an individual owner. Weyerhaeuser has owned and operated their company in Perquimans County for many, many years and have provided jobs to over 1,000 workers. They feel that wind energy is a compatible use for timber production and would produce jobs and an economic boost to the local economy. Specific concerns regarding the turbine placement can be considered during the conditional use permitting process. Adjusting the Wind Ordinance would kill the project and requests that the Board consider allowing the 2010 Ordinance to remain in effect.
- **Bill Elliott:** Mr. Elliott made the following comments: He works for Weyerhaeuser Company and has been working closely on this project. He appreciated the visit that some of the Commissioners and Planning Board members had at their site and hoped that it was beneficial to them. During their visit, they looked at the ¼ mile, ½ mile and 1 mile setbacks. He also worked with the Iberdrola project. If anyone has a concern about the sites, they should come and visit the property and make a decision for themselves. He thinks that there is a need and a tremendous plus to Perquimans County. He feels that a compromise can be made and that the project can move forward.
- **Don Giecek:** Mr. Giecek of Apex Clean Energy made the following observation and asked the Board to consider: Apex has followed closely the proceedings of the subcommittee and Planning Board. While the Planning Board members took their task quite seriously by considering points of view from across the spectrum, no reason was given as to why the setbacks from residences should be set at ½ mile. They seemed to arrive at this decision without the benefit of citing specific concerns whether it is sound, shadow flickering, etc. The Chair of the Planning Board sought to learn the precise technical reason but was not offered any logic to support the ½ mile setback. Mr. Giecek asked that the Board of County Commissioners take notice that the Planning Board Chair asked for specific reasons to move the setback to ½ mile and offered specific reasons why he thought the setback should remain as it was for Iberdrola. The Planning Board Chair steadfastly repeated that the Ordinance should remain unchanged in his opinion. Making a change to the ordinance to fit a specific project amounts to spot zoning. Apex planned the Timbermill project with the 2010 Ordinance as a technical and legal guide. Apex has made a considerable investment since that time in furtherance of the utilization of that 2010 Ordinance. We are fully committed to working with the Board of County Commissioners on whatever set of rules you establish. However, Mr. Giecek wanted to remind the Board that Apex feels that, according to N.C. State Law and Practices, the Conditional Use Permit process is the proper planning venue for making project specific rules and requirements. While it is difficult to calculate lost revenue by focusing entirely on wind turbines that may be lost by the ½ mile setback, he asks that the Board consider the possible future potential loss of business wanting to locate in Perquimans County due to the type of anti-business message that is being sent by changing the rules in the middle of the game. Similarly, if the county supports the ½ miles setback opponents in Chowan County will seize the opportunity to argue that they too should have the ½ mile setback. The net results of using the ½ mile setback would totally exclude the farmers from hosting a wind turbine. If both Counties agree to use the ½ mile setback, the value of the project may be diminished to the point that Apex will not be able to continue with the project.
- **Leary Winslow:** Mr. Winslow explained that he works and resides at 337 Cedar Stretch Road. He feels that changes to the wind ordinance (A2) are unacceptable. He pointed out that, upon your request, the Planning Board appointed a subcommittee to do their due diligence in researching changes for our wind ordinance. The subcommittee’s findings were presented to the Planning Board in the form of A4 which included a ½ mile set back from property lines, public roads, occupied buildings and residences etc. He personally believes A4 is a compromise as the citizens of the county asked for a 1 mile set back. The Planning Board ignored the subcommittee’s findings and weakened the setback recommendations. He feels the set back is the major issue here. With a proper set back you can eliminate the discussions relating to noise, shadow flicker, vibrations, infrasound, property values, etc. Without a proper set back, all of these items need to be addressed individually in our ordinance. Earlier today, he received findings from a third party engineering firm which included a 2000 foot fragment throw distance from a turbine blade. This information was shocking to me as we’ve been led to believe 2.5 times the height is an acceptable set back. If 2.5 times is the industry standard then he could only assume the wind industry came up with that number. He encouraged the commissioners to conclude on the side of caution when it comes to a proper set back.
- **Rita Saunders:** Ms. Saunders explained that her parents purchased their property in 1946 and have been paying taxes to Perquimans County ever since. She thinks that clean energy is very important and is asking that the Board keep the 2010 Ordinance. She also feels that it would be a great way to use their property.
- **A.O. Roberts:** Mr. Roberts is on the Planning Board. The other night when the Planning Board took their vote no one could tell him if the ½ mile setback would eliminate any of the farmers that wanted to participate in this project. He feels that our current ordinance is in line with Pasquotank County and with Chowan County. He also asked the Board of Commissioners to consider

our taxpayers. Any additional funds to our tax revenue will be helpful to our taxpayers. He encouraged them to think about those people when they make their decision.

- **Martin Drees:** Mr. Drees explained that he has lived in Perquimans County for ten years including five years of clearing the grounds and building his home. He and his wife selected Perquimans County to retire in because of its wonderful country setting, the beautiful farms, friendly people, quiet country living, and its beautiful sunsets over the Perquimans River. They have invested just about everything into building their home on the Perquimans River. They would not have moved here had they been told that the area would become an industrial complex with a wind farm to the northeast and the southwest of his home. The turbines, when constructed, will be visible in any direction from his home. The other concern that he has is the loss of property values. When the Planning Board was making their decision on the setbacks, the property values were not addressed because Apex stated that the values would not be affected. If that was the case, then why not include this in the ordinance. Mr. Drees has moved many times during his naval career and did not think that he would be moving again but he did not think that he would be betrayed by his local government.
- **Paul Kahl:** Mr. Kahl attended the ground breaking ceremony for Iberdrola and stated that he did not have a dog in the fight. He has done a lot of research on the internet and cited various articles about safety issues, property value issues, and health risks. He presented that research to the Board of Commissioners to review.
- **Bob Bastek:** After reviewing the proposed Text Amendment, Mr. Bastek had a couple of questions: (1) Why was the decommissioning requirement changed so radically? He does not know the impact on the developer by requiring a cash bond in lieu of an open letter of credit but more importantly the salvage value is not taken into consideration when determining the required amount; and (2) What was the basis of the change in Table #907.27 placing a 1/2 mile minimum setback from residences. He heard that it was a compromise from the 1 mile setback requested. He further stated that this would probably keep all wind farms from most of the County. He asked the Board to consider this scenario: If a farmer had just harvested his crop and his neighbor came by and asked for the whole crop; would it be a fair compromise if the neighbor asked for only half after he got off the ground?

There being no further questions or comments, Chair Cole closed the Public Hearing at 7:05 p.m.

AGENDA

On motion made by Edward R. Muzzulin, seconded by Matthew Peeler, the Board unanimously approved the Agenda as amended.

CONSENT AGENDA

The following items were considered to be routine and were unanimously approved on motion made by Edward R. Muzzulin, seconded by Matthew Peeler.

1. **Approval of Minutes:** December 7, 2015 Regular Meeting
2. **Tax Release Approvals:**

PERQUIMANS COUNTY TAX RELEASES:

McGowan, Jr., John J. & Anna T. -----	\$131.12
This house was picked up on wrong parcel. The house is listed on Parcel 2-D085-F044-SH. Account No. 0257647.	
Walker, William & Catherine -----	\$110.00
Mrs. Walker should have received a \$25,000 Senior Citizens discount. Account No. 517400.	
Markham, Catherine J. -----	\$125.18
Did not receive Senior Citizens exemption. Account No. 510210.	
Albemarle Gospel Music Association -----	\$185.68

PERQUIMANS COUNTY TAX REFUND:

Kutchenriter, Carol Jean -----	\$323.59
Situs correction. Her address is located outside city limits. Abstract No. 0029290818.	

3. **Personnel Matters:**

Employee Name	Employee Job Title	Action Required	Grade/ Step	New Salary	Effective Date
Stacey Mitchell	Deputy (SRO)	Termination			12/11/2015
Jennifer Patterson	Fill-In EMT	Resignation			12/17/2015
Addition to Job Classification	Water Technician III	Grade 68			1/1/2016
Charles Lories	Water Technician III	Appointment	68/12	\$45,899	1/1/2016
Cody Cornelius	Part-Time EMT-I	Certification	66/1	\$15.45/hr.	1/1/2016
Faran Sawyer	Deputy/SRO	Appointment	65/1	\$30,745	1/1/2016

4. **Step/Merit Increase:**

Employee Name	Employee Job Title	Grade/ Step	New Salary	Effective Date
Steven Pyle	Part-Time Telecommunicator	60/3	\$12.45/hour	1/1/2016
Marie Cuthrell	EMT-I	66/3	\$33,737	1/1/2016
David Murray	Deputy / SRO	65/3	\$32,283	1/1/2016

5. **Board Appointments:**

NAME	BOARD	ACTION	TERM	EFFECTIVE DATE
Jennings, William	Tax Assessor/Tax Collector	Reappointment	4 yrs.	2/1/2016
Muzzulin, Edward	Tourism Development Authority (Commissioners)	Reappointment	2 yrs.	2/1/2016
Yates, Fred	Tourism Development Authority (Winfall appointee)	Reappointment	2 yrs.	2/1/2016
Morgan, John	Agricultural Advisory Board - Parkville	Reappointment	3 yrs.	2/1/2016
Baker, Julian	Agricultural Advisory Board - Belvidere	Reappointment	3 yrs.	2/1/2016
Madre, Donald	Agricultural Advisory Board - Bethel	Reappointment	3 yrs.	2/1/2016

6. **Resolutions:** The following Resolutions were approved by the Board:

RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE ALBEMARLE RURAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION TO DELAY CONSIDERATION OF TOLLING FERRY ROUTES

WHEREAS, the North Carolina General Assembly adopted the Strategic Transportation Investment (STI) law in 2013; and,

WHEREAS, the STI law, also established a method for prioritizing transportation projects, the Strategic Mobility Formula, which is a new way of allocating available revenues based on data-driven scoring and local input,

WHEREAS, the Strategic Mobility Formula funds projects in three categories: Statewide Mobility, Regional Impacts and Division Needs; and,

WHEREAS, the Strategic Mobility Formula dictates that new and replacement ferry vessels and ferry support vessels can only be considered under the Division Needs category; and,

WHEREAS, the Albemarle Rural Planning Organization is within the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) Division One and NCDOT Division One hosts more North Carolina ferry routes and vessels than any other Division along the coast; and,

WHEREAS, the North Carolina Ferry Division has determined the costs of ferry vessel replacements for Division One to be \$192,000,000; and,

WHEREAS, NCDOT Division One is scheduled to receive roughly \$30,000,000, in the Division Needs Category, per year in Strategic Transportation Investment funding to fund Highway, Bicycle and Pedestrian, Aviation, and Ferry projects within its fourteen County region; and,

WHEREAS, inclusion of new and replacement ferry vessels and ferry support vessels in the Division Needs category will place an undue financial burden on all NCDOT Division One transportation projects; and,

WHEREAS; tolling the ferry routes does not generate the necessary funding to acquire new and, replacement ferry vessels and ferry support vessels and will still require consideration under the STI,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Perquimans County Board of Commissioners request that the Albemarle Rural Planning Organization refrain from considering tolling ferry routes until the 2016 session of the North Carolina General Assembly has an opportunity to explore and consider alternate funding sources for new and replacement ferry vessel and ferry support vessels.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Perquimans County Board of Commissioners are requesting that all the members of the Albemarle Rural Planning Organization support this endeavor.

Adopted this the 4th day of January, 2016, in Perquimans County, North Carolina.

Janice McKenzie Cole, Chair
Perquimans County Board of Commissioners

ATTEST:

Mary P. Hunnicutt, Clerk to the Board

7. Economic Improvement Council's Application for Community Services Block Grant Program:

- The State requires that the Economic Improvement Council (EIC) present their Community Service Block Grant Application to each County within their jurisdiction and request that the Clerk sign the attached Documentation of Submission. This is for Board information only.

PRESENTATIONS

The following presentations were made:

- **Presentation of Plaque – Joan Harrell:** Commissioner Nelson explained that he had received a text message from Ms. Harrell that she would not be able to attend tonight's meeting.
- **Introduction of New Employee:** Susan Chaney, Social Services Director, introduced Kiera Hinton, IMC I working toward IMC II, who began working for Perquimans County on December 1, 2015.

Chair Cole welcomed Ms. Hinton to Perquimans County.

DAVID BUCHANAN, DIRECTOR OF MAINTENANCE – PERQUIMANS COUNTY SCHOOLS

Prior to Mr. Buchanan's presentation, Susan Cox, Chair of the Perquimans County School Board introduced Matthew F. Cheeseman, the new Superintendent of Schools. Mr. Cheeseman made a few comments. Then, Mr. Buchanan presented the DPI Facility Needs Survey for Perquimans County Schools. Here is the summary that he presented:

**PERQUIMANS COUNTY SCHOOLS
2016 LONG RANGE MAINTENANCE AND FACILITY NEEDS 0-5 YEARS**

SCHOOL / BUILDING	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST ESTIMATE
PCS	2 Pre-K, 2 Kindergarten & 4 Grades 1-3 Classrooms	\$1,883,059
PCS	HVAC Replacement / Lighting	\$819,000
PCS	Student Drop Off Canopy	\$70,000
PCS	Access Control / CCTV Upgrade	\$37,500
PCS	Multi-Purpose Room Stage Curtains	\$11,400
PCS	Classroom Furniture Replacement	\$10,000
Perquimans Central School Total:		\$2,830,959
HGS	Complete Lighting Retrofit (Buildings A & C)	\$161,604
HGS	Curb & Gutter Front Parking Lot	\$22,800
HGS	Remove Asbestos Floor Tile / Install VCT Flooring (Buildings B & 20% Bld. C.)	\$30,000
HGS	Remove Single Pane Windows at Roof Line in Media Center and Install Wall	\$34,200
HGS	20 Space Asphalt Parking Lot	\$40,000
HGS	Access Control / CCTV Upgrade	\$37,500
HGS	Classroom Furniture Replacement	\$10,000
Hertford Grammar School Total:		\$336,104
PCMS	Complete Lighting & Ceiling Retrofit	\$353,960
PCMS	Gym Floor Replacement	\$91,200
PCMS	24 Space Asphalt Rear Parking Lot	\$40,000
PCMS	Curb / Gutter Front Parking Lot	\$11,400
PCMS	Replace VCT In Art Room & Lobby	\$13,680
PCMS	Access Control / CCTV Upgrade	\$37,500
PCMS	Student Drop Off Canopy	\$17,900
PCMS	Classroom Furniture Replacement	\$19,993
Perquimans Middle School Total:		\$585,633
PCHS	Complete HVAC System Renovation (Buildings B, C & D) including Ceiling / Lighting Upgrade	\$1,220,000
PCHS	Renovate Transportation Building for Vocational Classes	\$399,000
PCHS	Replace Roof on Second Story (Building C)	\$114,000
PCHS	Access Control / CCTV Upgrade	\$37,500
PCHS	Resurface Rear Access Road	\$45,600
PCHS	Area F Restroom Renovations (2)	\$30,000
PCHS	Classroom & Cafeteria Furniture Replacement	\$52,000
Perquimans High School Total:		\$1,898,100

DPI Facility Needs 0-5 Year Total:	\$5,650,796
---	--------------------

2016 LONG RANGE MAINTENANCE AND FACILITY NEEDS 6-10 Years		
SCHOOL / BUILDING	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST ESTIMATE
PCS	Replace Roof on Entire Building	\$504,023
HG	Replace Roof (Building E)	\$124,921
PCMS	Replace Roof on Cafeteria	\$16,929
PCS	Fire Alarm Panel	\$9,500
HGS	Fire Alarm Panel	\$9,500
PCMS	Fire Alarm Panel	\$9,500
PCHS	Fire Alarm Panel	\$9,500
DPI Facility Needs 6-10 Year Total:		\$683,873

SCHOOL / BUILDING	PROJECT DESCRIPTION	COST ESTIMATE
Administration Building	Complete Lighting Retrofit	\$40,000
Maintenance Building	HVAC System for Two Offices	\$9,500
Maintenance Building	Complete Lighting Retrofit	\$9,000
Transportation Building	New Transportation Facility	\$2,100,000
PCHS	Athletic Complex	\$5,000,000
Other Projects Total (Not Included in DPI Report):		\$7,158,500
GRAND TOTAL :		\$13,493,139.00

Mr. Buchanan highlighted a few items. After his presentation, Chair Cole opened up for questions and comments. The following question/comment was presented:

- **Commissioner Peeler:** Mr. Peeler asked about when the Junior School 2 + 2+ 4 will roll into the Grammar, Middle, and High School. What are we going to do for that influx of children? Mr. Buchanan said that currently the projections are going down. This was placed on the list because of the Pre-K situation. If the State would mandate Pre-K again, they would not have the room to handle it. That is why they have kept it on the list. Mr. Peeler just wanted to make sure that we had sufficient room for the influx of students.

On motion made by Matthew Peeler, seconded by Edward R. Muzzulin, the Board unanimously approved the 2016 Long Range Maintenance & Facility Needs Program.

ANGELA WELSH, ALBEMARLE COMMISSION – PLANNING DIRECTOR/RPO COORDINATOR

Ms. Welsh presented the Perquimans Comprehensive Transportation Plan (CTP) and requested that the Board authorize the Clerk to sign the Resolution approving the CTP Plan. After her presentation, Chair Cole asked if there were any questions or comments. The following questions/comments were made:

- **Commissioner Peeler:** Mr. Peeler asked about the flip-flop turn lane at Woodville Road. Is the plan to extend it that far? Ms. Welsh said that it was their recommendation to do that but funding will determine what they will do. He also asked about Perry’s Bridge Road turn lane that it is going to be 11’ all along Perry’s Bridge Road. Ms. Welsh said that is what is recommended.
- **Commissioner Peeler:** Mr. Peeler asked about drainage gates that are a problem with bicyclist. Gretchen Byrum, NCDOT Representative, addressed this matter. She said that NCDOT had prepared a study for this problem and asked where these problem areas were. Mr. Peeler said that it was along Edenton Road Street. Ms. Byrum said that she would follow up on that. Since they are close to the High School, it would place the bicyclist in an unsafe position.
- **Commissioner Muzzulin:** Mr. Muzzulin asked that, if the Board adopts this Resolution, will it have any effect on the Resolution for the replacement of the Hertford S-Bridge. Ms. Welsh said that it would not.

On motion made by Matthew Peeler, seconded by Wallace E. Nelson, the Board unanimously approved the following Resolution approving the Perquimans Comprehensive Transportation Plan:

Perquimans County
P.O. Box 45, Phone: (252) 426-8484
HERTFORD, NORTH CAROLINA 27944

After further discussion and review, upon a motion of Matthew Peeler, seconded by Wallace E. Nelson and, upon being put to a vote, was carried unanimously, the Board of Commissioners approved the following resolution:

Resolution
Adopting a Comprehensive Transportation Plan
For Perquimans County, North Carolina

WHEREAS, Perquimans County, the Town of Hertford, the Town of Winfall and the Transportation Planning Branch, North Carolina Department of Transportation actively worked to develop a comprehensive transportation plan for Perquimans County; and

WHEREAS, the County and the Department of Transportation are directed by North Carolina General Statutes 136-66.2 to reach agreement for a transportation system that will serve present and anticipated volumes of traffic in the County; and

WHEREAS, it is recognized that the proper movement of traffic within and through Perquimans County is a highly desirable element of the comprehensive plan for the orderly growth and development of the County; and

WHEREAS, after full study of the plan, and following a public meeting held by the Perquimans County, the Board of Commissioners of Perquimans County feels it to be in the best interest of Perquimans County to adopt a plan pursuant to General Statutes 136-66.2;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED: that the Perquimans County Comprehensive Transportation Plan be approved and adopted as a guide in the development of the transportation system in Perquimans County and the same is hereby recommended to the North Carolina Department of Transportation for its subsequent adoption.

ADOPTED, this the 4th day of January 2016.

I, Mary P. Hunnicutt, Clerk to the Board of Commissioners for Perquimans County, North Carolina, hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted in an adjourned meeting of said municipality held on January 4, 2016. WITNESS my hand and the official seal of the Perquimans County this the 4th day of January, 2016.

(Seal)

Mary P. Hunnicutt, Clerk to the Board
Perquimans County Board of Commissioners

HOWARD WILLIAMS, RECREATION DIRECTOR

Mr. Williams presented the annual report from the Recreation Department. He said that things are still busy there and is very pleased with the way that things have been going. The Board thanked him for his service.

BILL JENNINGS, TAX ADMINISTRATOR

Mr. Jennings presented the Board with his monthly report and updated the Board on the Revals and tax collections.

SUSAN CHANEY, SOCIAL SERVICES DIRECTOR

Ms. Chaney updated the Board on her department.

COMMISSIONER'S CONCERNS/COMMITTEE REPORTS

Chair Cole asked if there were any Commissioner's Concerns or Committee Reports. The following concern was mentioned:

- **Commissioner Muzzulin:** Mr. Muzzulin asked County Manager Heath about the junk cars in Snug Harbor. Mr. Heath said that, since we have hired the new Code Enforcement Officer, we have been receiving a monthly report. Mary Hunnicutt, Clerk to the Board, explained that we did not receive his report this month. Mr. Heath said that he would make sure that Mr. Muzzulin received an updated report.

There being no further Commissioners' concerns or committee reports, the Chair proceeded with the meeting.

UPDATES FROM COUNTY MANAGER

County Manager Heath presented the following update:

- **Conversion to State Health Plan:** Mr. Heath reported that the conversion to the State Health Plan has been completed and we continue to move forward. Commissioner Peeler asked if there were any negative remarks from the employees. Mr. Heath said that he did not receive any and that most of the comments were positive.

SHERIFF TILLEY'S REQUEST FOR A NEW CAR

Chair Cole explained that, at last month's meeting, Sheriff Eric Tilley requested another deputy's car. Ms. Cole asked if Mr. Tilley had any additional comments. There being none, Chair Cole asked for a motion to approve his request. On motion made by Edward R. Muzzulin, seconded by Matthew Peeler, the Board unanimously approved for Sheriff Tilley to purchase another car for his department. In order to cover the funds, the following Budget Amendment will need to be processed:

**BUDGET AMENDMENT NO. 9
GENERAL FUNDS**

CODE NUMBER	DESCRIPTION OF CODE	AMOUNT	
		INCREASE	DECREASE
10-510-740	Sheriff - Capital Outlay	23,800	
10-399-000	Fund Balance Appropriated	23,800	
EXPLANATION: To budget funds for additional vehicle purchase in FY 15/16 as discussed/approved at the 1/4/2016 Board Meeting.			

APPOINTMENT TO TRILLIUM NORTHERN REGION ADVISORY BOARD

Since Chair Cole received no recommendations for this appointment, the matter was tabled until next month's meeting.

ADMINISTRATIVE TEXT AMENDMENT NO. TXT-15-01

Chair Cole recognized Donna Godfrey, County Planner, who presented the updated information for the Text Amendment. She asked the Board if there were any questions for Ms. Godfrey. The following question was asked:

- **Commissioner Peeler:** Mr. Peeler asked Ms. Godfrey what was the evidence that the Planning Board used to support the ½ mile setback. Chair Cole explained that she thought a copy of the Minutes of the meeting was enclosed with their Agenda Packet. Mr. Peeler said that the reason he was asking this was because he had provided a great deal of information about the setbacks with a recommendation for a 1 mile setback but he did not see any reference to it. Ms. Cole said that she did not feel that Ms. Godfrey could provide the rationale of why the Board voted for the ½ mile setback. Ms. Godfrey said that they do not keep minutes for the work sessions. The ½ mile was done as a compromise because some of the smaller properties were deleted from the project with the 1 mile setback. After the general consensus of the subcommittee had been made to recommend the ½ mile setback, there was some discussion about the fact that the 2½ mile setback was scientifically sound from a safety standpoint.

Chair Cole asked Ms. Godfrey if there was any other information presented that the Board had not heard. Ms. Godfrey said that there was none. The Chair then stated that she wanted to determine how the Board wants to proceed. Ms. Godfrey asked that, before you act on the Text Amendment, the Board should consider a statement of consistency. Chair Cole asked if it was the items listed in the Agenda Packet. Ms. Godfrey said that it was. A proposed Text Amendment has been presented with the three changes recommended by the subcommittee and the Planning Board. She further stated that she feels that it would be better to discuss each individual change separately. She understood that there were some concerns about moving forward with action on this recommendation since the Board did not have the information needed. She asked for Board comments and recommendations. Wallace E. Nelson said that he feels that he is still gathering and getting information and does not feel that he is prepared to vote on the proposed changes. He would rather take more time to continue to digest the information that he had received as late as today. Commissioner Peeler, early on in this process, encouraged the Board to develop their own subcommittee which would include two or three commissioners and a couple of Planning Board members. This subcommittee would meet and hash out what we want it to say and then make the recommendation to the full Board along with the recommendation from the previous subcommittee. Chair Cole reminded the Board that we only have one more meeting before the moratorium expires unless we make the January Work Session a Special Called Meeting. County Attorney High said that we could carry over this month's Public Hearing to the next meeting. She further asked about advertisement for the Board's subcommittee meeting. Mr. High said that he would have to check into that. Commissioner Leigh asked Mr. Peeler what this newly formed subcommittee would do that the subcommittee from the Planning Board did not do. Mr. Peeler said that he was envisioning additional discussion on the setbacks and some of the other issues and also digest information received from the public meeting tonight. Commissioner Muzzulin said that he would rather see the entire Board meet and discuss the issues so we will not have to discuss it again. Mr. Peeler feels that they needed to

come together to discuss the issues before voting. Chair Cole pointed out that we have been receiving information since August, 2015; we have had public comments on various times; and she feels that the Board has not heard anything tonight that has not been brought to our attention earlier. Mr. Peeler mentioned the impact to aviation and feels that we need to look into that further. County Attorney High, after discussing it with Mr. Heath, wanted to clarify that we could have a public hearing and table it tonight to discuss it further with possible action later this month. He had not researched the information regarding a subcommittee meeting. Chair Cole asked for a motion. Commissioner Jones said, as we discussed before, it seems we have a couple of items that we need to look at: (1) Does the Board want to change the Ordinance? and (2) If the Board does want to change it, do they want to accept the recommendation of the subcommittee and Planning Board? If the Board did not want to accept their recommendation, how do they want to revise their recommendations. Chair Cole asked if there is a motion to table it tonight; motion to set up another subcommittee; motion to discuss this further; or what. County Attorney High said that, for the purpose of discussing the matter and moving forward, to move down the list that Chair Cole has presented to determine pleasure of the Board. Matthew Peeler made a motion to establish a subcommittee consisting of two to three commissioners, Donna Godfrey, and one or two Planning Board members to develop a recommendation to the full Board. Motion dies due to a lack of second. Chair Cole asked if anyone else had a motion on how to move forward. Wallace E. Nelson made a motion to table the decision until our next meeting. Kyle Jones seconded the motion. Mr. Nelson said that we have two more meetings to discuss this further and make a decision by the close of the moratorium on February 2, 2016. Mr. Peeler asked if we needed to specify if the decision was going to be made at the Work Session. Chair Cole said that in order for them to take action, they would have to declare the meeting a Special Called Meeting. Mr. Peeler retracted his question. Chair Cole called for the vote. The motion passed by a vote of five (5) to one (1) with Chair Cole voting against the motion. Therefore action on this proposed Text Amendment was tabled. Commissioner Peeler asked if they needed to determine if they would discuss it at the Work Session. Chair Cole said that they would discuss it at the Work Session but not for action. County Attorney High stated that it would probably be cleaner if you would discuss it during the Work Session and made a decision in February.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

The following comments were made:

- **Leo Higgins**: Mr. Higgins explained several reasons why Perquimans County did not need any further wind energy facilities.
- **Alan Lennon**: Mr. Lennon requested three things: (1) reschedule their meeting to the first Tuesday of the month unless it falls on a holiday then the meeting will be held the following day; (2) purchase the audio/PA system for upstairs courtroom; and (3) regular meetings, work sessions, and any other open to public meetings be recorded via video or audio for clarity and concision and be available to public with seven days from the meeting via the website.
- **Tommy Harrell**: Mr. Harrell talked about the tax revaluation. Surrounding counties have higher taxes than Perquimans County. He is asking that, since we now have a new superintendent, let's raise the tax rate to help him improve the education system in Perquimans County.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further comments or business to discuss, the Regular Meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m. on motion made by Edward R. Muzzulin, seconded by Fondella Leigh.

Janice McKenzie Cole, Chair

Clerk to the Board

* * * * *