

**THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA**

Monday, August 3, 2015

9:00 A.M. Worksession

MINUTES

Place: Commissioners' Chambers, second floor, Durham County Government
Administrative Complex, 200 E. Main Street, Durham, NC

Present: Chairman Michael D. Page, Vice Chair Brenda Howerton and Commissioners Fred
Foster, Jr., Wendy Jacobs and Ellen Reckhow

Presider: Chairman Michael D. Page

Citizen Comments

The Board of County Commissioners provided a 30-minute comment period to allow Durham County citizens an opportunity to speak. Citizens were requested to refrain from addressing issues related to personnel matters.

James Chavis expressed his concern for the Holton Career and Resource Center and requested that the Holton outside field be declared a Safe Haven field for special-needs youth with funds from the City of Durham, Durham County, and the Durham Public School system; additionally, he asked that Vice Chair Brenda Howerton and Commissioner Wendy Jacobs serve as ambassadors for this project.

John Tarantino performed a political satire.

Fredrick Davis stated that he was the citizen referenced on agenda item 15-585 and asked that the Board rename the Durham County Memorial Stadium in honor of the late Willie R. Bradshaw.

Donna Rudolf discussed the Wireless Communication Facilities Ordinance and was concerned there was not a program to inspect cell phone towers' functionality on a regular basis, she requested that one be made and enforced.

Dolly Fehrenbacher requested that the Board consider the notes she presented to them on the directives that were submitted to the City of Durham's Planning Department of changes that were made to the Wireless Communication Facilities Ordinance.

Chairman Page announced that all citizen comments would be addressed and each citizen who spoke would receive notice of any action taken from staff regarding their concerns or requests.

Commissioner Jacobs requested to add a discussion of the revised version of the cell phone tower ordinance to today's agenda. Vice Chair Howerton stated she was not prepared to discuss that item because research had not been completed. Chairman Page inquired as to which staff was assigned this and if they were prepared to give a report. County Manager Davis answered that the Joint City-County Planning Committee would be meeting on Wednesday, August 5th, to discuss this item. Chairman Page requested that Steve L. Medlin, AICP Planning Director, or another member of the Planning Staff be asked to come to the meeting later in order to give a summary of actions taken.

Chairman Page moved, seconded by Commissioner Jacobs, to add this item to the end of the agenda in order to discuss it with Planning Director Medlin.

The motion carried unanimously.

Discussion Items:

15-541 Durham County Judicial Building Renovation - Programming and Pre-design Update

County Manager Davis announced that each Commissioner had previously met with the architectural firm to give feedback and the resulting revisions were to be presented at this meeting.

Jay Gibson, Director of Engineering and Environmental Services, presented an update of the programming findings and the requested revisions. The project goals included re-purposing the Judicial Building, upgrading code compliance, reducing leased space, consolidating departments, and meeting the High Performance Building Policy. The project team issued the following recommendations: replace the plumbing, mechanical, and electrical systems; add a fire protection system; incorporate new telecom and data systems; reconfigure the elevator core; make the building sustainable; as well as design the interior for a twenty-year (20-year) growth projections. The departments that were proposed for relocation into the Judicial Building were the Register of Deeds, Tax Administration, Soil and Water Conservations, NC Forest Service – Durham County, Juvenile Justice, Engineering and Environmental Services, and Emergency Medical Services. Program components that were recommended were a leasable retail space, meeting or training spaces, a fitness center for staff, a television studio to allow County leaders to conduct media events and news releases, Commissioners' offices, and a central security center. The decision factors that influenced these recommendations were: County owned property, leased or shared property, department specific considerations, building modifications, public interfacing, assembly space component, inadequate space, operational improvements, department in multiple locations, state funded agencies, parking needs.

Commissioner Foster asked how many employees were currently in the Probation Office located at 3325 Chapel Hill Boulevard. Josh Brady, architect at O'Brien/Atkins Associates, P.A., responded that there were five (5) units with nine (9) people per unit and therefore a total of 45 employees. Each employee had a state owned patrol vehicle that was required to stay on site, as well as their own personal vehicle. Commissioner Foster questioned whether the parking scarcity had already been addressed in the Master plan or if it was still waiting to be discussed. Mr. Brady answered that the Master plan would help identify the optimal location for them due to its holistic nature. Director Gibson reiterated that the primary objective in relocating the two independent Probation Offices would be to reduce the County's obligation of paying a lease, i.e., reduce expenses.

Mr. Brady presented the Board with two different illustrations of the exterior of the Judicial Building. Both versions addressed the same goals and criteria that were set forth, but through different means. Option 1 changed the proportions of the form of the building through a series of horizontal elements, the lower levels had been opened up with glass to increase activity and movement from inside and out, upper floors had a high performance glass curtain wall which brought in daylight and transparency. The stairs on Main Street had been pulled down to the street façade so as to form a more gradual connection. A horizontal canopy that ran the entire length of the Main Street facade would define the main entrance of the building as well as the outdoor component of the retail space. The rear side showed continuous glass all the way across the first two floors and generated a different feel than the front side, this would guide visitors towards the desired side in order to enter the building.

Option 2 maintained some of the vertical column wraps that currently existed on the building with two horizontal bands on the third and seventh floors. The planters and granite walls that exist along Main Street had been removed in order to open up the plaza level and increase the liveliness of the retail space interaction between Main Street and the Durham County portion of the building. The stairs were extended and broadened to create a more inviting path. The main entrance was defined by the vertical columns on either side and there were horizontal canopies on either side of the main entrance.

Commissioner Foster noted that there was no horizontal canopy over the main entrance in Option 2 and suggested that there be glass canopy so as to better protect people from any precipitation. Mr. Brady responded that they would take his suggestion into consideration. Commissioner Foster stated his preference for Option 1.

Mr. Brady reaffirmed that both options fulfilled the goals and requirements that the County requested. Option 1 was a total reskin of the building and Option 2 was a more selective demolition. He discussed the timeline of the project and stated that the design work should be done by February 2016 thus leading the County to be able to occupy the Judicial Building by the end of 2017.

Commissioner Jacobs thanked staff and O'Brien/Atkins Associates, P.A. for their work and inquired as to why the growth projection for the building was only 20 years. Director Gibson and Senior Project Manager Peri Manns clarified that 20 years was a fairly standard projection for growth in the industry and the projection was not applicable to the life of the building.

Commissioner Jacobs asked about the plans for the parking lot. Mr. Brady responded that there were 22 parking spaces underneath the Judicial Building and approximately 23 spaces in the lot outside the building, the departments recommended to be relocated into the Judicial Building did not exceed parking availability. Commissioner Jacobs wondered about the possibility of adding a level to the outside parking lot. Mr. Brady explained that adding a second level would be very difficult because of the needed clearances due to steep grade changes.

Commissioner Jacobs expressed her desire to have public art incorporated into the Judicial Building's design. She stated that an illustrated view of the Judicial Building from the corner of Roxboro Street and Main Street would also be helpful. Commissioner Jacobs then inquired whether a cost difference existed between the two building options; that this information might impact the Board's preferences between the two building options. Mr. Brady answered that the costs were still being calculated, but that Option 1 had more demolition and new material going into it and was therefore the more expensive option.

Commissioner Jacobs asked if they would be able to reuse the granite that was going to be removed. Mr. Brady replied that they were already searching for ways to reuse any materials that would be removed from the Judicial Building. Commissioner Jacobs asked how the interior of the building would be impacted by either design. Mr. Brady answered that based on exterior design alone there would not be much difference between the two options.

Commissioner Howerton thanked staff for their work and expressed concern regarding the surrounding streets being inaccessible during development and requested a method be found in order to avoid road blockades. Director Gibson said that they could ensure that streets remained accessible.

Chairman Page stated his appreciation for the firm's and staff's work on this project. He reiterated the importance of using public art and added that there should also be a description detailing the significance and intention of the art piece. Chairman Page questioned whether the entire first floor

would be a retail space. Mr. Brady explained that only the south half of the first floor would be retail space. Chairman Page asked what types of retail businesses were envisioned to be there and whether the choice would be given to the County. Mr. Brady responded that the County would have the authority when deciding who to lease the retail space to, but the vision leaned towards restaurants and after-hours types of businesses.

Chairman Page wanted clarification regarding the Judicial Building elevators. Director Gibson, Mr. Brady, and Senior Project Manager Manns explained that, in essence, the elevators were currently back-to-back and the reconfiguration of the elevator core would combine two double-elevator lobbies into one (1) four-elevator lobby. Chairman Page asked if the front part of the Judicial Building would have picnic tables. Mr. Brady confirmed that there would be some type of seating area.

Chairman Page inquired about the utilization of a reception or security desk similar to the one in the Human Services Complex or if any offices in the Judicial Building would utilize badge-access security. Manager Davis assured him that the firm would be consulting with the security manager, but that a definitive answer could not be given until after they proceed into the design portion of the project.

Chairman Page stated his preference for Option 1 as did Vice Chair Howerton and Commissioners Jacobs and Foster. Commissioner Jacobs explained that she preferred Option 1, but with the pedestrian design layout from Option 2 because it would be a better catalyst in activating the street level space.

Manager Davis stated that the project team would continue into the design phase, present the results and a demo to the Board for feedback, and then transition into the construction phase.

15-588 Report on Youth Development Efforts in Durham

Manager Davis began by discussing the importance of effective collaboration between organizations in Durham that catered to disenfranchised youth. He introduced the organizations that were represented at the meeting: Made in Durham, Youth Opportunity Initiative, Workforce Development Board, and My Brother's Keeper. He wanted to acknowledge DeWarren Langley, County Intern, for his work as a liaison between all the organizations which allowed for this discussion and created a deeper understanding of the work still left to be accomplished.

Mr. Langley began by saying that the discussion centered around the question "how can we better serve our young people?" in terms of providing better opportunities and better life outcomes. He declared that there still needed to be an underlining strategy to improve collaboration between youth service providers. He introduced Dr. Lorraine Taylor, Director of Youth Opportunity Initiative; Dionne Hines, Staff Liaison for MBK initiative; Kevin Dick, Executive Director of the Office of Economic and Workforce Development; Malcom Reed, Youth Opportunity Coordinator; and Meredith Holmes, Executive Director of Made in Durham.

(Commissioner Reckhow entered the meeting during the presentation)

Dr. Taylor thanked the Board and stated that their focus was on embracing and driving change that would result in measurable and meaningful impact for Durham's opportunity youth. The term "opportunity youth" was defined as young people aged between 14-25 who were not in school, unemployed, and may be dealing with other life challenges. There were approximately four thousand opportunity youth in Durham and African-American boys and men made up the majority of this group. Durham had a history of active community engagement focused on youth and young adults, there were 108 different youth-centered non-profit organizations counted in 2014.

Ms. Holmes gave a presentation describing the history, accomplishments, structure, and engaging methods of Made in Durham whose mission was to be a public-private partnership committed to enabling all Durham youth and young adults to achieve a post-secondary credential and begin a rewarding career by age 25.

Mr. Dick discussed various youth-centered programs, specifically the Workforce Development Board and the NCWorks Youth Programs. The Durham Youth Employed and Succeeding (YES) program worked with youth at least one (1) year behind in school, low income, and have multiple barriers to employment and educational success in order to connect them with as many interventions as possible. Durham Youth Work Internship program had 1881 applications submitted for City and County positions (not including those that applied to private-sector positions) and only 481 internship slots developed. Special recognition was given to Sterling Mason, youth intern for the County's IS&T Department and rising sophomore at North Carolina A&T State University, who stood as Mr. Dick detailed his current duties, to demonstrate that Youth Work was a very beneficial resource.

Ms. Hines expounded on the inception of the My Brother's Keeper Initiative, a commitment to create a platform and mechanism that gathered resources, collected data, developed a set of best practices, and implemented a structure of support to strengthen the Black and Brown community with a special emphasis on young men of color. When Durham accepted the My Brother's Keeper challenge issued by President Obama, approximately 160 Durham community leaders pledged their support for MBK Durham. The four (4) areas that MBK Durham decided to focus on were educational attainment, job training and placement, court involvement, and health. MBK Durham was currently at the policy review and recommendation stage, the following step would be to develop the policy review into an action plan which would be presented to the community in November of 2015.

Dr. Taylor presented the Board with results from a survey that was administered to community partners during a summit previously held; the resulting data indicated that Durham's youth service providers were lacking in the ability to collaborate effectively. The proposed solution would be to implement a strategic alignment plan in which members, i.e. youth providers, joined self-selected clusters that focused on specific challenges that opportunity youth encounter. The cluster categories were based on projects that were already operating; fairly paralleled to the Mayor's Poverty Reduction Teams.

Commissioner Howerton thanked the panel and inquired about a physical place where opportunity youth could access resources for various different challenges that were not online; those who did not have internet access or know about the specific organizations that catered to their particular life situation. Sean Johnson, student at Durham Technical Community College, volunteered that the youth could speak with any authority figures at Durham Tech and get information that pertained to their specific needs. Mr. Reed stated that there was not a "one-stop hub" for opportunity youth. Mr. Langley added that the Durham Teen Center existed, but the Durham Youth Coordination Board, which had served as a one-stop shop for opportunity youth, ceased to exist. He suggested it was something the County may want to consider restoring. Ms. Holmes made special note of the fact that there were currently 230 spaces in different programs for youth who wanted to reengage in their education, but over 2,000 youth who needed these services; it was necessary to be able to meet the needs of all opportunity youth.

Commissioner Jacobs thanked the panel and expressed her concern of the lack of website where youth providers could list resources and information, similar to Chapel Hill's youth-centric website located at <http://cheyouth.org>. Ms. Holmes stated the Youth Network was a 24-member "by youth, for youth" organization that was interested in creating such a website.

Commissioner Reckhow emphasized Commissioner Jacobs's point about creating a youth-centric website and strongly encouraged the panel to complete it within the next year. She concurred that to increase the youth-appeal the website's appearance should be fun and interesting, not overly clinical or formal. It would also be beneficial to create an accountability piece for progress of the projects.

Report on Revised Cell Phone Tower Ordinance

Chairman Page announced that the Board would now discuss the revised version of the Cell Phone Tower Ordinance with Director Medlin and review a report of actions taken thus far. Manager Davis explained to Director Medlin that his presence was requested because there were inconsistencies between the Board-given directives and the recommendations that Planning consequently gave.

Commissioner Jacobs read the three (3) directives aloud and noted that the first directive (regarding ordinance safety requirements) was properly addressed by staff, but inquired about the second directive that allowed for rural residential areas within the suburban tier to have a 120 foot tall tower. Director Medlin clarified that all directives were submitted to staff almost verbatim and gave a rundown of each directive's progress. Research of other jurisdictions was required for the first directive because the County did not have the expertise to perform periodic inspections of towers, it was found that more often than not, third-party inspectors were hired for this. The second directive was not addressed because the City Council was adamantly against it at the time it was submitted to them—this required policy discussion at Joint City-County Planning Committee.

Commissioner Reckhow thanked Director Medlin and stated that third-party compliance inspectors would be better and requested that the ten (10) year maintenance interval be changed to five (5) year maintenance intervals.

Directive: change the ten (10) year maintenance intervals to five (5) year maintenance intervals in the Revised Cell Phone Tower Ordinance.

15-585 Discussion on Naming Policies and Whether the Board of Commissioners Should Change the Name of the Durham County Memorial Stadium

Attorney Siler and Willie Darby, Senior Assistant County Attorney, detailed their research into the history of the Durham County Memorial Stadium in order to determine who had the authority to name public facilities within the County and who had the authority to rename the stadium. Attorney Siler stated that the history was somewhat ambiguous and a few newspaper findings were the only things that mentioned its naming. Furthermore, the Board was technically allowed to rename the stadium without having to create a name-change policy, but best practices dictated that it was desirable. Mr. Darby suggested three (3) options: the first would be to rename it as "Durham County Memorial Stadium/Willie Bradshaw Stadium"; the second would be to do a full name change; and the third would be to name a field or track within the stadium in Mr. Bradshaw's honor.

Commissioner Reckhow thanked Attorneys Siler and Darby for their work. She stated that the term "memorial" in the name was in honor of World War 1 and World War 2 veterans and a renaming would therefore be problematic. She recommended naming a significant area within the stadium after someone like Willie Bradshaw and used Duke University's Coach K. Court as an example.

Chairman Page strongly advocated for Durham citizens' key interest in naming policy decisions. He and Vice Chair Howerton had received many phone calls in support of the name change since Mr. Bradshaw's service and would feel comfortable leaving the word "memorial" in the name, and suggested "Bradshaw Hunt Memorial Stadium." Vice Chair Howerton also concurred with this position.

Commissioner Foster called Pastor Davis back to the microphone and asked what his stance was on the name "Bradshaw Hunt Memorial Stadium." Pastor Davis stated his recommendation was that the stadium be named "Willie Bradshaw Stadium" and that Mr. Bradshaw was a veteran. Commissioner Foster supported creating a naming policy as well as the name change to "Willie Bradshaw Memorial Stadium," but would prefer to receive the Stadium Authority's feedback.

Attorney Siler wanted it to be on record that the Memorial Stadium Authority had yet to discuss this matter. Chairman Page agreed to allow the Authority to discuss it and hear their recommendation, but encouraged promptness so as to keep Mr. Bradshaw's impact and history alive. Chairman Page announced that this item would be placed on the September 8, 2015 Worksession Agenda.

Commissioner Jacobs thanked staff, concurred that "memorial" should remain a part of the name, and stated that there needed to be a naming policy for any future requests. She found Mecklenburg County's policy favorable, but didn't agree with Wake County's due to the rule dictating that any namesakes must be deceased. She asked whether the board would like to create a naming policy similar to Mecklenburg County's.

Directive:

- Place this item on the September 8, 2015 Worksession Agenda.

15-583 Presentation on the Durham Diabetes Coalition

Gayle Harris, Public Health Director, began the presentation by introducing the panel as follows: Dr. Lisa Pullen Davis, Senior Project Manager; Michele Easterling, Director of Nutrition Services; and Melissa Downey-Piper, Director of Health Education.

Dr. Pullen Davis stated that the Durham Diabetes Coalition, a Durham County Public Health Department project, was a collaborative partnership between organizations that strived to improve population-level diabetes management, health outcomes, and quality of life for diagnosed and undiagnosed adults with Type II diabetes and worked to reduce disparities based on race, age, gender, socioeconomic status, and insurance status. The Durham Diabetes Coalition had been able to expand its reach and ability to help more people through the Public Health Department's efforts as well as through different collaborations thanks to funding. Ms. Easterling explained the significant impact of the home-visit interventions and detailed two success-story case studies. Ms. Downey-Piper expounded on the many events and projects that the Durham Diabetes Coalition had held in an effort to further their cause. A video that visually summarized a few of the efforts of the Durham Diabetes Coalition was shown.

Directive: Chairman Page requested that the Board be informed of the mini-grants the Durham Diabetes Coalition awards to other community organizations that relate to their core mission so as to be able to broadcast them and increase their accessibility.

Ms. Harris brought up concerns for the future of the Durham Diabetes Coalition due to the lack of funding. She stated that the CDC red-lighted Durham County for the number of lives lost due to kidney disease and one of the major complications of diabetes was kidney failure; a clear indicator that these services were very much needed in Durham County. Chairman Page agreed that they did have to continue to keep the health of the community a priority and commended the phenomenal staff at the Public Health Department.

Commissioner Jacobs asked whether staff also connected clients to other resources during treatment and

if that meant that they were partnering with other County departments or organizations. Ms. Easterling and Ms. Harris explained that staff undergo training to learn how to recognize when a client needed a connection, they were then able to guide the client to the correct place for help. Recognizing that this was a powerful model, Commissioner Jacobs inquired about the contact of the community workers and the neighborhoods—how did the community workers gain the trust and respect of the community? Ms. Easterling responded that the ideal community worker was a well known member of the community they were serving, but otherwise the community workers were honest about their knowledge, trained to conduct motivational interviewing, and had great people skills.

15-584 Discussion on Sports Commission

Chairman Page announced that Item 15-584 Discussion on Sports Commission had been pulled from the agenda and would be brought up again at the September 8, 2015 Worksession for follow-up.

Directive: Put Item 15-584 Discussion on Sports Commission on the September 8, 2015 Worksession agenda.

15-530 Report on Boards and Commissions

Michelle Parker-Evans, Clerk to the Board, reported and presented on the Boards and Commissions. She explained how to use the Boards and Commissions website, features, searching, tracking, members, and vacancies.

Ms. Parker-Evans stated there was interest in reinstating the Durham Cultural Advisory Board as a Joint City-County Board. Lauren Brune, Budget Intern, added the Durham Cultural Advisory Board could provide more support and opportunity for cultural initiatives in Durham as a Joint City-County Board.

Commissioner Jacobs commented she would like to pursue the Durham Cultural Advisory Board as a Joint City-County Board.

Chairman Page asked if the Durham Cultural Advisory Board applied to the community as a whole or applied more to public places. Ms. Parker-Evans replied The Durham Cultural Advisory Board applied more to art and the City-County Appearance Commission applied more to the general community as a whole.

Vice Chair Howerton asked for staff to check to see if the art component was being covered by other boards and commissions or if the Durham Cultural Advisory Board needed to be reinstated as a Joint City-County Board.

Commissioner Reckhow commented the County would welcome the Durham Cultural Advisory Board's recommendations about public art related to government buildings even though the members were appointed by the City.

Lowell Siler, County Attorney, asked whether each board had a County Commissioner as a liaison. Ms. Parker-Evans responded that not every board or commission had a County Commissioner as a liaison.

Ms. Parker-Evans discussed the Community Child Protection/Child Fatality Protection Team. She added the Child Fatality Protection team had been meeting, but the Community Child Protection team had not been meeting. Ms. Parker-Evans stated the boards were coordinating to meet compliance. She mentioned that Durham County Emergency Medical Services Council (EMS) was not active. Mr. Siler added he would check to see if the EMS Council was a statutory board or not and if it could be disbanded.

Commissioner Reckhow asked if the Boxing and Wrestling Commission was still active. Ms. Parker-Evans responded the Boxing and Wrestling Commission was still active and had two new members and one vacancy.

Ms. Parker-Evans asked the Board for feedback on a policy regarding how long a person would have to stay off a board after serving the maximum term time before the person could reapply to become a member of the same board.

Chairman Page commented that members should stay off a board one year. Vice Chair Howerton stated that members should stay off longer than one year to give other citizens a chance to serve. Commissioner Jacobs commented that one year is long enough for a member to stay off a board. She asked for staff to check the policy of other counties.

Ms. Parker-Evans asked the Board for feedback on a policy regarding the term limit of a member serving an unexpired term. Commissioner Reckhow suggested if a member was appointed to a board serving an unexpired term of less than a year, then the unexpired time would not count against the maximum term limit.

Commissioner Reckhow stated she would like to have the vacancies and titles included on the main page with the boards and commissions. The Clerk agreed to see if the software would allow that addition. She added when a vacancy was advertised for several months and no applications were received, staff should reach out to professional groups to help fill the vacancy. Commissioner Jacobs suggested that Chairman Page mention the vacancies that had been advertised for several months during his announcements.

Directives:

- **Staff to check to see if the art component was already being covered by other boards and commissions or if the Durham Cultural Advisory Board needed to be reinstated as a Joint City/ County Board.**
- **Staff to check the policy of other counties to see how long they require members to staff off a board after serving the maxim term time before being able to reapply.**
- **Reach out to Professional groups to help fill long term vacancies.**
- **Add long term vacancies to the announcements.**

Durham County Detention Facility Discussion:

County Manager Davis addressed an article written in The News and Observer newspaper “*Durham County Jail More Restrictive than Similar Area Jails.*” He added due to the article being published, the Board could receive calls and emails.

Commissioner Reckhow asked County Manager Davis to meet with Sheriff Andrews about allowing The Bureau of Justice or The National Institute of Corrections to review the jail and provide technical advice.

Commissioner Jacobs mentioned asking Sheriff Andrews to attend a Worksession to give the Board a report on the jail. Commissioner Reckhow stated asking Sheriff Andrews to attend a Regular session

meeting so the report of the jail could be broadcast on cable television. She continued to say the Board could have a conversation with Sheriff Andrews in closed session during his evaluation.

Mr. Siler commented the conversation with Sheriff Andrews could be part of the evaluation work plan process.

Commissioner Foster expressed the importance of written documentation to Sheriff Andrews.

Vice Chair Howerton asked if Sheriff Andrews would be notified of the conversation. County Manager Davis stated he would call or email Sheriff Andrews to notify him of the conversation about the concerns at the jail.

Directive:

- County Manager Davis to meet with Sheriff Andrews to regarding the possibility of allowing The Bureau of Justice or The National Institute of Corrections to review the jail and provide technical advice.**

Adjournment

Commissioner Reckhow moved, seconded by Vice Chair Howerton that the meeting be adjourned.

The motion called unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

Tania De Los Santos
Administrative Support Assistant