

OXFORD, NORTH CAROLINA
September 24, 2020

The Members of the Honorable Board of Commissioners of Granville County, North Carolina met in a special meeting on Thursday, September 24, 2020 at 7:00 p.m. in the Meeting Room, Granville Expo and Convention Center, 4185 US Highway 15 South, Oxford. The purpose of the special meeting was to conduct a special use permit hearing for a proposed Wireless Telecommunication Tower near the Town of Stem off of Tump Wilkins Road. The Board anticipated going into closed session pursuant to G.S. §143-318.11(a)(3), (4) and (6).

Present were:

Chairman: David T. Smith

Commissioners: Ernie Anderson Sue Hinman
Zelodis Jay Timothy Karan

Tony W. Cozart was absent.

County Manager: Michael S. Felts

County Attorney: James C. Wrenn, Jr.

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

At 7:00 p.m., Chairman David T. Smith called the special meeting to order.

MOMENT OF SILENCE

Chairman Smith announced that Commissioner Edgar Smoak passed away on September 11, 2020. He served as a County Commissioner since December of 2010. A moment of silence was held in his memory.

MEETING CONTINUED

Chairman Smith gave the invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance. He welcomed Commissioner Ernie Anderson, the District 5 appointment replacing Owen Roberts, who was sworn in on September 16, 2020 to the Granville County Board of Commissioners.

AFTER HOLDING QUASI-JUDICIAL HEARING, BOARD APPROVED SPECIAL USE PERMIT APPLICATION BY USCOC OF GREATER NORTH CAROLINA, LLC, FOR A WIRELESS COMMUNICATION TOWER OFF OF TUMP WILKINS ROAD

Chairman Smith said that the matter on the agenda was a quasi-judicial hearing to rule on an application for a special use permit submitted by USCOC of Greater North Carolina, LLC dated July 28, 2020 for the location of a wireless telecommunications facility on property

owned by Robert Butler and Rhonda Brandes located off of Tump Wilkins Road in Stem, NC. He then entertained a motion to open the hearing.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Sue Hinman, seconded by Commissioner Zelodis Jay, and unanimously carried, the Board opened the quasi-judicial hearing.

Chairman Smith stated that both proponents and opponents of the permit would be given an opportunity to present evidence and arguments. He added that due to COVID-19, anyone wishing to speak or present evidence for or against the proposed special use permit, would be sworn in by the Clerk before speaking.

Chairman Smith recognized Barry Baker, Planning Director, for a preliminary statement of the case.

Having been duly sworn, **Barry Baker, Planning Director, 122 Williamsboro Street, Oxford, NC,** stated that this was a public hearing for a special use permit application for a self-supported wireless telecommunication tower on property owned by Robert Butler Sr. and Rhonda Brandes. The property is accessed from Tump Wilkins Road across property owned by Mamie Wilkins, is zoned Agricultural Residential 40 (AR-40), and specifically identified as tax parcel map number #088904613029. He stated that all public notices as required by local and state law have been accomplished. He mentioned that the property is in the Falls Lake Watershed and that 12,000 square feet of land disturbance requires a stormwater plan approved before the issuance of a building permit if a special use permit is granted. He said the agenda packet contains extensive review. Granville County wireless consultant, Cityscape Consultants, Inc. reviewed the application materials. He said that Elizabeth Harrington Smith with Cityscape Consultants was present. He asked that she present the review letter and opinion dated September 8, 2020.

Having been duly sworn, **Elizabeth Smith, 6898 Silverado Terrace, Lake Worth, Florida,** stated that she is with Cityscape Consultants, Inc., the wireless consulting service for Granville County. She said that when the application was submitted, they did a thorough review of it and took a look at it from different perspectives such as planning, engineering as well as from a legal prospective. She said they check the work codes as well as the state and federal regulations. She said they look at it from an engineering prospective to see the height requirement that is being requested. The application initially came in with a 250 foot lattice tower, they made a determination that based on the coverage area a 195 foot tower would

suffice, so the applicant modified their application for a shorter tower. She said they also looked at the application and compared it to the Granville County ordinance and looked at what is being installed as well as the future potential, as part of the code includes that a tower will be built for additional co-locators. She noted they made sure it would be built to accommodate tenants. They reviewed landscaping and noted that the tower will be in a very rural wooded area. She said there were issues with the balloon test as the location is so wooded they had to make some adjustments. Based on everything that CityScape looked at and compared to the code, the recommendation was that the applicant did prove that the proposed facility is required based on services needed in the area. She said because it was generally accepted and was adequately demonstrated for technological reasons. She said they did state that the tower was designed for multiple carriers per the code. She noted they did a whole report and said she could answer any questions..

County Attorney Wrenn asked Ms. Smith if she was going to introduce the report into evidence and she stated yes. (Note – Telecommunications Site Review, North Carolina, New Structure letter from CityScape Consultants, Inc., pages 5-10 in agenda packet admitted as evidence)

Commissioner Hinman asked why they decided to go with the shorter tower as obviously more internet would be needed in the area eventually.

Ms. Smith said there were several reasons. One reason was that if you went with a taller tower it would need to be lit due to FAA regulations, so lighting would have to be added for consideration of the area because it is very dark. And that could cause it to light up people's homes and cause that issue. But as far as the coverage, CityScape found from an engineering technological process and looking at the information submitted, if the tower was brought from 250 feet to 195 feet, then it would not affect any additional coverage. She said that in effect, you would still get the same amount of coverage as it was not necessary to have the additional height.

Commissioner Hinman said that area does need coverage bad.

Commissioner Jay said that with the original height, you would still get the same coverage even though it is lower.

Ms. Smith said that is right.

Chairman asked for clarification on page six of the agenda where it said, *CityScape knows that this facility will operate in various spectrums that may have interfering potential with other services.*

Ms. Smith explained that they look at frequencies that the areas will be operating in and we found that there will not be interference. She said the applicant did submit documentation if there was any interference they would take care of it immediately. She said there is a lot of new spectrum being introduced and being auctioned off, so there is a potential, but as the wireless consultant we review the possibility of co-locators coming onto the tower and make sure there will be no interference.

Chairman Smith noted on page 6, it also says *Accordingly, the Applicant, U.S. Cellular Wireless, has met the requirements of the Granville County Ordinance, State and Federal statutes, and should be approved.* He asked if that was CityScape's recommendation.

Ms. Smith answered that is correct. She said CityScape would recommend approval should the Board choose to approve it.

Chairman Smith asked Attorney Wrenn for instruction for the Board.

Attorney Wrenn gave instructions to the Board.

INSTRUCTIONS TO BOARD—SPECIAL USE PERMIT

WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES

The Federal Telecommunications Act, as codified at 47 U.S.C. § 332(c)(7), allows municipalities (including counties) to regulate the placement of wireless service facilities. Part 3B, Article 18, Chapter 153A of the North Carolina General Statutes, "Wireless Telecommunications Facilities, sets out the statutory framework pursuant to which local governments can regulate wireless telecommunications facilities. The Wireless Facility and Wireless Support Structure Siting Ordinance for the County of Granville is found in Article IX of Chapter 32 of the Granville County Land Development Code. Section 32-572(c) requires a special use permit for all new wireless support structures.

In order to grant a special use permit to construct a new freestanding wireless support structure, the Board must find that the applicant demonstrated why a site of a higher priority was not selected. In order to find that the applicant demonstrated why a site of higher priority was not selected, the applicant must have demonstrated to the satisfaction of this board the reason or reasons why such a permit should be granted for the proposed site and the hardships that would be incurred by the applicant if the permit were not granted for the proposed site.

The above-referenced eight orders of priority for constructing a new wireless support structure are set out in Ordinance §32-572(a) as follows:

- (1) Attached concealed antenna onto an existing structure;

- (2) Collocated antenna on existing freestanding wireless support structures;
- (3) Attached nonconcealed antenna onto an existing structure;
- (4) Freestanding wireless support structures on a site with an existing wireless support structures or tall structure;
- (5) Concealed freestanding wireless support structures on county-owned property;
- (6) Concealed freestanding wireless support structures on other property in the county;
- (7) Nonconcealed freestanding wireless support structures on county-owned property;
- (8) Nonconcealed freestanding wireless support structures on other property in the county.

In addition to these general requirements, the Ordinance also sets out specific requirements for all new wireless support structures:

Sec. 32-573. - General requirements for all wireless support structures and broadcast facilities.

- (a) *Security of wireless support structures.* All wireless support structures shall be located, fenced or otherwise secured in a manner that prevents unauthorized access. Specifically as follows:
 - (1) All antennas, towers and other supporting structures, including guy wires, shall be made inaccessible to individuals and constructed or shielded in such a manner that they cannot be climbed or run into; and
 - (2) Transmitters and telecommunications control points must be installed in a manner to be readily accessible only to persons authorized to operate or service them.
- (b) *Signage.* Wireless support structures shall contain a sign no larger than four square feet to provide adequate notification to persons in the immediate area of the presence of an antenna that has transmission capabilities. The sign shall contain the name(s) of the owner(s) and operator(s) of the facility, an emergency phone number(s), and FCC registration number, if applicable. The sign shall be on the equipment shelter or shed of the applicant and be visible from the access point of the site and must identify the equipment shelter of the applicant. The sign shall not be lighted unless the board shall have allowed such lighting or unless applicable provisions of law require such lighting. No other signage, including advertising, shall be permitted on any wireless support structure, unless required by law.
- (c) *[Access.]* At a wireless support structure site, an access road, turn around space, and parking shall be provided to assure adequate emergency and service access. Maximum use of existing roads, whether public or private, shall be made to the extent practicable. Road construction shall at all times minimize ground disturbance and vegetation cutting. Road grades shall closely follow natural contours to assure minimal visual disturbance and reduce soil erosion.
- (d) *[Setbacks.]* All wireless support structures and broadcast facilities shall be set back from abutting property lines and recorded rights-of-way by the following distances: a distance equal to the height of the wireless support structure or broadcast facility tower or structure or use breakpoint technology as provided for in subsection 32-579(8)a. Any accessory structure shall be located so as to comply with the applicable minimum setback requirements for the property on which it is situated.

In making these findings of fact, the Board's decisions must be based on competent, material, and substantial evidence in the record. Substantial evidence is more than a mere scintilla. It means such relevant evidence as a reasonable mind might accept as adequate to support a conclusion. It must do more than create the suspicion of the existence of the fact to be established.

The concurring vote of a majority of the members of the Board shall be necessary to grant a special use permit. Vacant positions on the Board and members who are disqualified from voting on a quasi-judicial matter shall not be considered members of the board for calculation of the requisite majority, if there are no qualified alternates to take the place of such member.

As always, a member of this Board shall not participate in or vote on a special use permit in a manner that would violate affected persons' constitutional rights to an impartial decision maker. Impermissible violations of due process include, but are not limited to, a member having a fixed opinion prior to hearing the matter that is not susceptible to change, undisclosed ex parte communications, a close familial, business, or other associational relationship with an affected person, or a financial interest in the outcome of the matter. If an objection is raised to a member's participation and that member does not recuse himself or herself, the remaining members shall by majority vote rule on the objection.

Chairman Smith said we will now hear evidence from the applicant.

Having been duly sworn, **Mike Doran, 5855 Square Drive, Greenville, NC**, with US Cellular thanked CityScape for the review of the application. He said Ms. Smith had covered it well but he would touch on a few points. The tower will be constructed to hold four additional carriers –five total. He said there will be landscaping as this will be constructed at a tree line, but should the tree line come down they will do a vegetative buffer. He then asked if they need to do that prior to or after the vegetation gets removed.

Mr. Baker said that the landscaping needs to be installed prior.

Mr. Doran said that this particular tower is servicing Stem and 4-5 miles along Interstate 85 as the main coverage area. The tower sits between two existing structures, one in Creedmoor and one in Oxford. This tower will sit right in the middle and should provide good coverage for this area. He said he was there to answer any other questions.

Attorney Wrenn asked if he wanted his application to be submitted as evidence.

Mr. Doran said he would. (Special Use Permit Application from USCOC of Greater North Carolina, LLC, pages 11-136 in agenda packet submitted as evidence)

Chairman Smith asked if there were any individuals who wish to present evidence against the special use permit. There were none. He then asked if Board members had any questions and there were none. He then entertained a motion to close the hearing.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Zelodis Jay, seconded by Commissioner Ernie Anderson, and unanimously carried, the Board closed the hearing.

Chairman Smith asked Attorney Wrenn to summarize the evidence that was presented to the Board.

County Attorney Wrenn summarized the evidence presented to the Board. No one objected to the summary of evidence.

Chairman Smith opened the floor for discussion, comments or further questions and there was none.

Chairman Smith said that the Board would now vote on each required finding of fact.

County Attorney Wrenn said he would summarize the required finding of facts since he had just read them if okay with the Board. He said the first finding of fact sets out that the tower lies with the order of priority rank set out by Ordinance §32-572.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Timothy Karan, seconded by Commissioner Zelodis Jay, the Board voted unanimously that the first finding of fact was met based on the substantial evidence submitted by the consultant.

County Attorney Wrenn said the second required finding of fact dealt with fencing. The Board must find that all wireless support structures shall be located, fenced or otherwise secured in a manner that prevents unauthorized access and the specific requirements were previously reviewed.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Ernie Anderson, seconded by Commissioner Zelodis Jay, the Board voted unanimously that the second finding of fact was met based on the information submitted as evidence in the consultant's report.

County Attorney Wrenn said the third required finding of fact dealt with signage. The Board must find that the wireless support structures shall contain a sign no larger than four square feet to provide adequate notification to persons in the immediate area of the presence of an antenna that has transmission capabilities. The sign shall contain the name(s) of the owner(s) and operator(s) of the facility, an emergency phone number(s), and FCC registration number, if applicable. The sign shall be on the equipment shelter or shed of the applicant and be visible from the access point of the site and must identify the equipment shelter of the applicant. The sign shall not be lighted unless the board shall have allowed such lighting or

unless applicable provisions of law require such lighting. No other signage, including advertising, shall be permitted on any wireless support structure, unless required by law.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Timothy Karan, seconded by Commissioner Ernie Anderson, the Board voted unanimously that the third finding of fact was met based on competent and substantial evidence submitted by the consultant.

County Attorney Wrenn said the fourth required finding of fact relates to access. The Board must find in summary that the wireless support structure site, an access road, turn around space, and parking shall be provided to assure adequate emergency and service access.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Timothy Karan, seconded by Commissioner Zelodis Jay, the Board voted unanimously that the fourth finding of fact was met based on competent and substantial evidence submitted by the consultant.

County Attorney Wrenn said the fifth required finding of fact dealt with set-back. Wireless support structures and broadcast facilities shall be set back from abutting property lines and recorded rights-of-way by the following distances: a distance equal to the height of the wireless support structure or broadcast facility tower or structure or use breakpoint technology as provided for in subsection 32-579(8)a. Any accessory structure shall be located so as to comply with the applicable minimum setback requirements for the property on which it is situated.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Timothy Karan, seconded by Commissioner Zelodis Jay, the Board voted unanimously that the fifth finding of fact was met based on competent and substantial evidence submitted by the consultant.

Chairman Smith stated that the Board had voted in support of each required finding of fact. He asked if there was anything else to discuss as it relates to this application for special use permit.

Chairman Smith asked the time frame of the construction of the tower once it is approved.

Mr. Doran said it will be a first quarter 2021 build.

Chairman Smith asked once the tower is built, when something will be placed on it.

Mr. Doran said it is one project so once it is built, tenants locate on the tower.

Chairman Smith then entertained a motion to approve or deny the special use permit.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Zelodis Jay, seconded by Commissioner Sue Hinman, and unanimously carried, the Board approved the Special Use Permit as follows:

GRANVILLE COUNTY

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

ORDER GRANTING SPECIAL USE PERMIT

On the date listed below, the Board of Commissioners for Granville County (the "Board") met and held a quasi-judicial hearing to consider the following application.

Applicant: USCOC of Greater North Carolina, LLC

Owners of record Robert Butler and Rhonda Brandes (as of date of hearing)

Property Location: Located off of Tump Wilkins Rd., Stem, Tally Ho Township Granville County, NC

Tax Parcel Id. Number: 088904613029

Legal Description: See attached Exhibit "A"

Proposed Use of Property: New Wireless Support Structure

Meeting Date: September 24, 2020

Having heard and reviewed all the evidence and arguments presented at the hearing, the Board finds that the application is complete and that, based upon the evidence presented, the proposed new wireless support structure complies with all of the applicable requirements of the Granville County Land Development Ordinance (the "Ordinance") for the use proposed, specifically including, but not limited to, the standards in Chapter 32 of the Ordinance and the specific requirements for the proposed use set out in Article IX (Wireless Telecommunications Facilities) of Chapter 32 of the Ordinance. Therefore, the Board grants the application to make use of the above-described property for the purpose indicated herein and the same is hereby approved, subject to all applicable provisions of the Ordinance and the terms hereinafter set forth.

In making this decision, the Board reviewed the six standards in Ordinance § 32-1101, including the specific requirements for the proposed use set out in Article IX (Wireless Telecommunications Facilities) of Chapter 32 of the Ordinance. Having heard the evidence presented at this hearing, the Board makes the following **FINDINGS OF FACT** (collectively the "Findings of Fact"):

1. That the following documents and exhibits were submitted into evidence: (i) Applicant's Granville County Special Use Permit Application dated July 28, 2020, including all attachments and addendums thereto (the "SUP Application"); and (ii) Telecommunications Site Review report dated September 8, 2020 prepared by CityScape Consultants, Inc. consisting of six (6) pages (the "Consultant's Report").
2. That the following persons provided sworn testimony to the Board concerning the application for special use permit: (i) Elizabeth H. Smith, Consultant for CityScape Consultants, Inc. (the "Consultant") on behalf of the Applicant; (ii) Mike Doran on behalf of the Applicant and (iii) Barry Baker, Granville County Planning Director.
3. That the Applicant is requesting a special use permit to allow a new wireless support structure in property that is zoned AR-40, which use is allowed under the Ordinance but only by special use permit. Applicant proposes to construct a new one hundred ninety-nine (199) foot lattice-type tower.
4. That the Applicant is seeking a special use permit to develop a new wireless support structure on the Property herein described in accordance with the site plan attached to the Special Use Permit Application accepted into evidence.
5. That based on the SUP Application, the Consultant's Report, and the testimony of the Consultant, the Applicant has (i) satisfactorily demonstrated why a site of a higher priority was not selected in accordance with Ordinance § 32-572 testified as to various requirements for a new wireless support structure as set out in the Ordinance having been met; and (ii) met, satisfied, and/or complied with the general requirements set out in Article IX (Wireless Telecommunications Facilities) of Chapter 32 of the Ordinance.
6. That there was no testimony or opposition to the proposed new wireless support structure.

Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact, the Board makes the following conclusion as to each standard set forth in Section 32-1101 of the Ordinance:

1. All applicable specific conditions pertaining to the proposed use contained in Article IX of Chapter 32 have been or will be satisfied.

The Board unanimously finds, based on the testimony and other evidence presented, including but not limited to Findings of Fact set forth above, which are hereby incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein, that the applicant's proposed use of the property will conform to the standards set out above and in set out in Article IX (Wireless Telecommunications Facilities) of Chapter 32 of the Ordinance. No competent evidence, as defined in § 160A-393, was presented in opposition to this finding. The Board unanimously finds that the evidence shows that this finding has been met.

2. Access roads or entrance and exit drives are or will be sufficient in size and properly located to ensure automotive and pedestrian safety and convenience, traffic flow, and control and access in case of fire or other emergency.

The Board unanimously finds, based on the testimony and other evidence presented, including but not limited to the Finding of Fact set forth above, which are hereby incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein, that the proposed access and exit drives will be sufficient to meet this requirement. No competent evidence, as defined in § 160A-393, was presented in opposition to this finding. The Board unanimously finds that the evidence shows that this finding has been met.

3. Off-street parking, loading, refuse and other service areas are located so as to be safe and convenient, allow for access in case of emergency, and to minimize economic, glare, odor and other impacts on adjoining properties in the general neighborhood.

The Board unanimously finds, based on the testimony and other evidence presented, including but not limited to the Finding of Fact set forth above, which are hereby incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein, that the proposed access and exit drives will be sufficient to meet this requirement. No competent evidence, as defined in § 160A-393, was presented in opposition to this finding. The Board unanimously finds that the evidence shows that this finding has been met

4. Utilities, schools, fire, police, and other necessary public and private facilities and services will be adequate to handle the proposed use.

The Board unanimously finds that the evidence shows that this finding has been met. The Board unanimously finds, based on the testimony and other evidence presented, including but not limited to the Finding of Fact set forth above, which are hereby incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein, that the proposed access and exit drives will be sufficient to meet this requirement. No competent evidence, as defined in § 160A-393, was presented in opposition to this finding. The Board unanimously finds that the evidence shows that this finding has been met

5. The location and arrangement of the use on the site, screening, buffering, landscaping and pedestrian ways harmonize with adjoining properties and the general area and minimize adverse impact.

The Board unanimously finds, based on the testimony and other evidence presented, including but not limited to the Finding of Fact set forth above, which are hereby incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein, that the proposed access and exit drives will be sufficient to meet this requirement. No competent evidence, as defined in § 160A-393, was presented in opposition to this finding. The Board unanimously finds that the evidence shows that this finding has been met

6. The type, size and intensity of the proposed use, including such considerations as the hours of operation and number of people who are likely to utilize or be attracted to the use, will not have significant adverse impacts on adjoining properties or the neighborhood.

The Board unanimously finds, based on the testimony and other evidence presented, including but not limited to the Finding of Fact set forth above, which are hereby incorporated by reference as if fully set forth herein, that the proposed access and exit drives will be sufficient to meet this requirement. No competent evidence, as defined in § 160A-393, was presented in opposition to this finding. The Board unanimously finds that the evidence shows that this finding has been met

Based upon the evidence presented, the Board unanimously finds that the proposed use meets the requirements set out in the Ordinance for the reasons stated above and, as a result, grants the Applicant's application for a special use permit.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the application for special use permit referenced herein be **GRANTED** and the same shall be binding on them and their respective heirs successors in interest.

BOARD WENT INTO CLOSED SESSION

Upon a motion by Commissioner Sue Hinman, seconded by Commissioner Zelodis Jay, and unanimously carried, the Board went into closed session as allowed by G.S. 143-318.11(a)(3), (4) and 6) to discuss an attorney-client matter; to discuss matters relating to the location or expansion of industries or other businesses in the area served by the public body, including agreement on a tentative list of economic development incentives that may be offered by the public body in negotiations; and to consider the qualifications, competence, performance, character, fitness, conditions of appointment, or conditions of initial employment of an individual public officer or employee or prospective public officer or employee; or to hear or investigate a complaint, charge, or grievance by or against an individual public officer or employee.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Ernie Anderson, seconded by Commissioner Sue Hinman, and unanimously carried, the Board returned to regular session.

BOARD APPROVED PURCHASE OF 911 RECORDING SYSTEM AND LICENSES

The Board took the following action regarding the Emergency Communications Department in order to meet the “Go Live” timeline and new ESInet standards.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Zelodis Jay, seconded by Commissioner Sue Hinman, and unanimously carried, the Board approved the purchase of a 911 recording system and licenses from CRS (Carolina Recording Systems, LLC), in the amount of \$80,842.50, with \$79,847.50 from restricted 911 funds and \$995 from the general fund.

BOARD APPROVED WAIVING PURCHASE PROCEDURE FOR PURCHASE OF SHERIFF’S VEHICLE DUE TO COVID-19

The Board took the following action regarding the Sheriff’s Office due to the effect of COVID-19 on vehicle availability.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Sue Hinman, seconded by Commissioner Ernie Anderson, and unanimously carried, the Board approved waiving the regular purchase procedure for purchasing a SUV for the K-9 unit, if a vehicle can be found.

BOARD APPROVED LETTER REGARDING GRANVILLE HEALTH SYSTEM

The Board took the following action regarding Granville Health System.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Ernie Anderson, seconded by Commissioner Sue Hinman, and unanimously carried, the Board approved a letter of opposition from the Board of Commissioners regarding Four County Endoscopy Center, LLC's Certification of Need application to develop an Ambulatory Surgical Facility in Oxford, Granville County, North Carolina; Project ID #K-11941-20.

COMMISSIONERS ADJOURN

Upon a motion by Commissioner Zelodis Jay, seconded by Commissioner Ernie Anderson, and unanimously carried, the Board adjourned at 8:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Debra A. Weary, NCCCC, CMC
Clerk to the Board