

**From:** [Perdita Holtz](#)  
**To:** [Alice Gordon](#); [Greg Wilder](#)  
**Cc:** [Barry Jacobs](#); [Bernadette Pelissier](#); [Earl McKee](#); [Alice Gordon](#); [Mark Dorosin](#); [Penny Rich](#); [Renee Price](#); [Donna Baker](#); [Michael Talbert](#); [Craig Benedict](#); [David Hunt](#); [Ashley E.. Moncado](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Questions and Comments for May 8 agenda  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 07, 2014 5:16:57 PM

---

All,

The frequency and timing of public hearings will be a policy decision the Board will eventually make (or will choose to keep the existing process in place) . The proposed UDO text amendment does not specify that there can be only one public hearing per month (and comments were made in the past about ensuring the public hearings are not always in the same location), so it's possible that for some months, the BOCC may desire to stagger the public hearings differently. Also, there have also been comments made about changing the existing dates for the QPHs into some other sort of BOCC meeting rather than doing away with the meeting date. Additionally, as a reminder, public hearings will not necessarily have to be designated only on regular meeting dates (e.g., they could be designated on work session dates, if the Board desires to do so).

Finally, it's possible that future BOCCs may wish to hold public hearings more frequently than 8 times per year so if a maximum number were established, a UDO text amendment would be necessary in the future to establish a different number of public hearings. The proposed text amendments have been written to provide future flexibility to Boards without requiring text amendments for small changes to the process.

As always, we're happy to address questions and comments and if the Board has specific questions about the proposed public hearing process changes, we'd appreciate hearing them before the public hearing on May 27<sup>th</sup> so we can conduct research, if necessary, prior to the hearing.

Thanks,

Perdita Holtz, AICP  
Planning Systems Coordinator  
Orange County (NC) Planning Department  
P.O. Box 8181 (mailing)  
131 W. Margaret Lane, 2<sup>nd</sup> floor (physical)  
Hillsborough, NC 27278  
Phone: 919.245.2578  
[pholtz@orangecountync.gov](mailto:pholtz@orangecountync.gov)

**From:** Alice Gordon [mailto:[gordon.alice@gmail.com](mailto:gordon.alice@gmail.com)]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 07, 2014 4:55 PM  
**To:** Greg Wilder  
**Cc:** Barry Jacobs; Bernadette Pelissier; Earl McKee; Alice Gordon; Mark Dorosin; Penny Rich; Renee Price; Donna Baker; Michael Talbert; Craig Benedict; David Hunt; Perdita Holtz; Ashley E.. Moncado

**Subject:** Re: Questions and Comments for May 8 agenda

Greg,

Thank you for the information. For item 6-f (legal ad), the information Perdita Holtz provided for the January Planning Board Ordinance Review Committee (ORC) meeting was the material to which I was referring. It shows that there are only 7 months for which public hearings seem feasible. Therefore I was wondering why a MINIMUM of 8 hearings was being proposed. It would appear more reasonable to propose a maximum of eight hearings, which is double what we have now. That would allow for one hearing in each of the seven months discussed at the ORC meeting (Feb, Mar, April, May, Sept, Oct, Nov) and one extra hearing.

Thanks again.

Alice Gordon

On Wed, May 7, 2014 at 3:12 PM, Greg Wilder <[gwilder@orangecountync.gov](mailto:gwilder@orangecountync.gov)> wrote:  
Commissioner Gordon:

Please see follow-up information in **BOLD BLUE** below and in the attachment.

Greg

**From:** Alice Gordon [mailto:[gordon.alice@gmail.com](mailto:gordon.alice@gmail.com)]

**Sent:** Wednesday, May 07, 2014 9:47 AM

**To:** Barry Jacobs; Bernadette Pelissier; Earl McKee; Alice Gordon; Alice Gordon; Mark Dorosin; Penny Rich; Renee Price; Donna Baker; Michael Talbert; Greg Wilder

**Cc:** Craig Benedict

**Subject:** Questions and Comments for May 8 agenda

Questions/ Comments for May 8 agenda

Item 6-f - Legal Ad

p. 2, item 2 - paragraph 3. The number of public hearings proposed is a minimum of eight. In previous materials there was an analysis by staff of the months when public hearings could probably not be held (e.g. July and August when the BOCC does not meet). If I recall correctly, the staff came up with 7 months when hearings could likely be held. Could you send that analysis to us again?

**Perdita Holtz with the Planning & Inspections does not recall Planning staff providing written materials regarding specific months for public hearings. Specific months would be contrary to the idea staff is proposing, which is that the BOCC set the public hearing schedule each year as it sees fit, so long as a minimum of 8 hearings are scheduled. Perdita reviewed some of the past materials**

provided to the BOCC and did not see any mention of specific months.

Perdita noted that she did mention specific months at the January Planning Board Ordinance Review Committee meeting as the example of staff's thinking, so Commissioner Gordon may have read those minutes. The excerpt from the ORC minutes is below:

**Paul Guthrie:** You have similar language in 2.8.8b. Another question, have you thought about how you would space the 8 mandatory hearing dates?

**Perdita Holtz:** It is going to be up to the BOCC to decide that but we as staff are going to recommend to them that they probably do hearings in the months of February, March, April, May, September, October, November. January they only have one meeting per year and it is usually very full and in December those are the last meetings before the break so we don't want to put them there plus the agenda deadlines are different due to the holidays. June is off as it is very budget heavy month when they have to adopt the budget by the end of the month. That is our staff recommendation but the BOCC will stagger them however they want.

**Perdita can provide additional information if necessary.**

Item 6-g - SAPFO

pp. 11-12 - II.C Analysis of 5 years of projections

Thank you for using the H and L method of showing the differences between the projections and the

actual numbers. Should you show the differences for 2013 (2013-14) as well? **Follow-up Information From Ashley Moncado with Planning & Inspections**

**The tables on pages 11 and 12 provide an analysis of membership projections made in the past five years for the 2013-2014 school year. The purpose of this table is to provide a historical review of projections made in a previous year for the 2013-2014 school year and how they compare to actual membership numbers. Due to the purpose of this table, there is no way to show the difference for 2013-2014 since that is the current year. However, analysis showing membership projections for the 2013-2014 school year compared to actual membership can be reviewed on pages 41 and 43 of the agenda.**

p. 13 - OCS - High School Level - C. The initial capacity of Cedar Ridge HS was 1000 students, not 500.

**The report has been revised to reflect the correct initial capacity of 1,000 for Cedar Ridge High School.**

p. 41 - OCS - Elementary School Level - AVG - The average projection number is missing.

**The average projection for OCS Elementary School membership was equal to the actual student membership for this year. This occurrence may have been the first time in SAPFO history where a projection number and an actual membership number were equal. As a result, there was not a number to provide in the table since projections were neither high nor low. However, staff has addressed this comment by placing the word 'equal' within the table to reflect the final outcome.**

**Ashley appreciated the comments and can respond to any additional questions or comments. The revised pages for Item 6-g –**

**Attachment 4, the 2014 SAPFOTAC Report, are attached.**

**From:** [Greg Wilder](#)  
**To:** [Alice Gordon](#); [Barry Jacobs](#); [Bernadette Pelissier](#); [Earl McKee](#); [Alice Gordon](#); [Mark Dorosin](#); [Penny Rich](#); [Renee Price](#); [Donna Baker](#); [Michael Talbert](#); [Clarence Grier](#); [Craig Benedict](#)  
**Cc:** [David Hunt](#); [Ashley E. Moncado](#); [Perdita Holtz](#); [James Groves](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Additional Questions/ Comments for May 8, 2014 agenda  
**Date:** Thursday, May 08, 2014 11:54:23 AM

---

Commissioner Gordon:

Please see below in **BOLD BLUE** follow-up information regarding your comments/questions.

Greg

**From:** Alice Gordon [mailto:gordon.alice@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 07, 2014 4:43 PM  
**To:** Barry Jacobs; Bernadette Pelissier; Earl McKee; Alice Gordon; Alice Gordon; Mark Dorosin; Penny Rich; Renee Price; Donna Baker; Michael Talbert; Greg Wilder; Clarence Grier; Craig Benedict  
**Subject:** Additional Questions/ Comments for May 8, 2014 agenda

Additional Questions/ Comments for May 8 agenda

A. Item 6-g - SAPFO

(1) pp. 11-12 - II.C Analysis of 5 years of projections (additional questions)  
Please compare the numbers on these two pages with the numbers on pages 37-44 of the agenda materials. It appears that the numbers on these summary tables (pp. 11 and 12) and the numbers on pages 37-44 are not the same for the years 2012-13 and 2011-12. Please check for accuracy. If by some chance some pages are not correct, then please check any related text for accuracy.

**From Ashley Moncado - The referenced numbers are correct. The purpose of the tables (Analysis of 5 Years of Projections for 2013-2014 School Year) provided on pages 11 and 12 is to provide an analysis evaluating projections made since 2008 for only the 2013-2014 school year. This table is included in the SAPFO to illustrate how accurate the previous five years of projections have been in predicting school membership for the 2013-2014 school year for all school levels in both districts. The majority of the numbers contained in the 'Analysis of 5 Years of Projections' tables for 2013-2014 school year are developed from the last five SAPFOTAC Annual Reports.**

**The tables on pages 37 and 39 were certified last year for the 2013 SAPFOTAC Annual Report and evaluate actual student membership from the 2012-2013 school year compared with student projections developed for the 2012 SAPFOTAC Annual**

**Report (2011-2012 school year). These numbers are not directly related to the tables provided on pages 11 and 12, since those tables are specifically addressing historical projections for only the 2013-2014 school year. The numbers for the tables on pages 11 and 12 and the tables on pages 37 and 39 do not match since they are not analyzing the same school year.**

**The tables on pages 41 and 43 are to evaluate actual student membership numbers for the 2013-2014 school year compared with projections developed for the 2013 SAPFOTAC Report (2012-2013 school year). These numbers are the most recent projections available to analyze student membership projections compared with actual student membership. Relating back to the tables on pages 11 and 12, these tables' may not match because the majority of numbers shown on pages 11 and 12 are student membership projections from 2008-2013 SAPFOTAC Reports. However, the actual student membership numbers for the elementary, middle, and high school levels for the 2013-2014 school year are the same as student membership numbers provided on pages 41 and 43. Additionally, the student membership projections provided from 2012-2013 are similar to the numbers utilized on pages 41 and 43 to evaluate projections and actual student membership.**

(2) pp. 65 and 66 - Attachment 5 - Student Projections

On page 65, CHCCS student projections, there is a note showing that high school #3 was completed in Fall 2007. The previous year, high school capacity was at 116%, which exceeds the 110% level of service that should have triggered the construction of an additional CHCCS high school.

On page 66, OCS student projections, there is a note showing that middle school #3 was completed in Fall 2006. The previous year middle school capacity was at 108.5%, which exceeded the 107% level of service that should have triggered the construction of an additional OCS middle school.

Please confirm the reason that these levels of service were exceeded. My understanding is that, in the MOU for SAPFO, the SAPFO adequacy test was suspended for these two levels of service (CHCCS high school level and OCS middle school level) until the proposed capacity could be added for that school system. When OCS middle school #3 (Gravelly Hill Middle School) was built, the middle school level was included for OCS and when CHCCS high school #3 (Carrboro High School) was built, then the high school level was included for CHCCS.

**From Perdita Holtz - Commissioner Gordon is correct that the SAPFO adequacy test was suspended for these two school levels**

**in the MOUs (and subsequent development regulation amendments) during the time period mentioned. The purpose of suspending the adequacy test was that these two levels were already above, or very close to exceeding, the agreed-upon maximum capacity levels when the SAPFO was adopted in July 2003. If the adequacy test had not been suspended, the effect of SAPFO adoption would have been to curtail residential development in both school districts immediately upon adoption of SAPFO.**

**B. Item 6-h - Buckhorn-Mebane EDD**

- (1) Pages 2 and 3 - Will the total cost of the Buckhorn EDD Phase 2 Sewer Extension Project be \$4.8 million, including the design costs of \$393,000? Or are the design costs added to the project cost, for a total of almost \$5.2 million?

**From Craig Benedict - The total cost of the Phase 2 extension project will be \$4.8 million which includes the capital and design costs.**

- (2) What was the total cost of the Buckhorn EDD Phase 1 Sewer Extension Project, including design?

**From Craig Benedict - The project prior to the project above was known as Buckhorn-Mebane Phase 2 and is under construction. The total cost was \$5,013,046 of which \$439,500 was design costs or 8.8%. In comparison both projects are actual or projected to have design costs under 10% which for complex utility engineering is good. For project nomenclature reference, Buckhorn-Mebane Phase 1 was the Gravelly Hill Middle school lift station and force main Petro truck stop area which was constructed in 2006. This project was designed in years prior to engineering being in the planning department.**

- (3) Is there a separate statement for Budget Amendment #7-C? In the financial impact section on page 2, there is a description but it is not clear whether that is the actual amendment.

**From Craig Benedict - This item both includes the contract amendment and the budget amendment 7-C. Planning works with the finance department and attorney's office to prepare these affiliated changes.**

**From Clarence Grier - For Items 6h and 6K, these are additions to Budget Amendment 7. There is not a separate budget statement for these items. We will include a summary for future amendments of this type.**

C. Item 6-j - Emergency Services Strategic Plan  
Page 14 - Strategic Goal #2, Objective 1 - Is the North Chatham Volunteer Fire Department included as one of the fire agencies?

**From Jim Groves - Yes, North Chatham and Chief John Strowd are included in this Goal. We work closely with Chief Strowd. In fact, we are currently hosting meetings to determine how we can better notify North Chatham when their assistance is requested in Orange County in order to help improve response times.**

D. Item 6-k - Cardiac Monitors  
Page 2 - Is there a separate statement for Budget Amendment #7-B?  
(See similar question for item 6-h.)

**From Clarence Grier - For Items 6h and 6K, these are additions to Budget Amendment 7. There is not a separate budget statement for these items. We will include a summary for future amendments of this type.**