

**TOWN OF HUNTERSVILLE
TOWN BOARD MEETING
MINUTES**

**August 1, 2022
6:00 p.m. – Huntersville Town Hall
101 Huntersville-Concord Road**

PRE-MEETING

None

**REGULAR MEETING
TOWN OF HUNTERSVILLE
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS**

The Regular Meeting of the Huntersville Board of Commissioners was held at the Huntersville Town Hall, 101 Huntersville-Concord Road, at 6:00 p.m. on August 1, 2022.

GOVERNING BODY MEMBERS PRESENT: Mayor Melinda Bales; Commissioners Dan Boone, Rob Kidwell, Amber Kovacs, Lance Munger, Derek Partee and Stacy Phillips.

Mayor Bales called the meeting to order.

Mayor Bales called for a moment of silence.

Mayor Bales led the Pledge of Allegiance.

STAFF QUESTIONS

Mayor Bales requested an update on the Main Street project.

Kevin Fox, Director of Public Works, reported the work on the water line on Huntersville-Concord Road and the work at the southern roundabout are progressing on schedule.

Commissioner Kidwell questioned how many current lawsuits the Town has.

Emily Sloop, Town Attorney, noted there is one suit involving ElectriCities that is being handled by outside legal counsel. I will check with Human Resources Director on any workers comp cases.

PUBLIC COMMENTS, REQUESTS, OR PRESENTATIONS

Kim Strickland, Public Information Officer, presented update on the livestream platform. *Refer to PowerPoint attached hereto as Exhibit No. 1.*

Jeff Sny, 13945 Old Vermillion, said I'll just start as me the citizen. I wasn't prepared to talk about this but seeing we were just having a conversation on Facebook, it would be my opinion to drop the streaming of the meetings on Facebook all together and I don't think there should be comments on those. I don't think when we sit on the dais or any of you are on the dais that those comments should be looked at and monitored during a meeting and questions asked based on those. I do know that happens and I don't find that appropriate. If I can switch hats and go to my Planning Board hat. I was recently elected the Chair of the Planning Board. Two months ago we discussed as the Board the quasi-judicial process. I went into that meeting prepared to vote to make it administrative. Much to my surprise after a healthy conversation that most people didn't get to hear out in the meta world, we voted unanimously as a Board to keep it quasi-judicial. I think that's important to point out, if for no other reason our rationale to it was that we, although a sliver, we as a town, we as the Planning Board, you as commissioners, maintain a sliver of leverage for the developers that are coming in. You can have that conversation. If they know that they have to come in and have a conversation and look for a little bit of win-win, then things get done. If they know that they can come in, they don't have to have that conversation. They drop off their paperwork and if they are asked to change something, they can just say no because I can say no, then they are going to do that. It's human nature. We need to maintain the little bit of leverage and with that leverage you will note that it often comes from our community members, they come in, they want to be heard. Commissioner Munger just said people have a right to be heard. They do have a right to be heard. I know they don't always understand the process of quasi-judicial, but things do happen from that. I very much ask you to consider that tonight before you move forward.

Hal Bankirer, 17206 Linksvie Lane, said like Chairman Sny, I am also going to talk about agenda item 9.A. While our Planning staff is really excellent, my 11 years of experience on the Planning Board demonstrates differences with their analysis and certainly some of their recommendations. Planning Boards and the like, they are called different things different places, were created by the state to allow for citizen representation in land use decisions and in land use policies. Towns are chartered by the state and although their boards vary greatly, they have legal gravitas and the authority to do what's necessary concerning land use policies and decisions, but they still also represent the people. That's who elected you. You provide oversight to the Planning Board by way of its membership and its levels of authority. Planning staff will do doubt mention that other municipalities may have gone the administrative route. In my view, surrender of the authority and representation of the bodies I just mentioned, the Planning Board, Town Board, to employees of the Town who are neither elected nor appointed will be an aggregation of your responsibility.

Emanuel Allen, 13228 Central Avenue and 13332 Central Avenue, (Tamia Williams deferred her 3 minutes to Mr. Allen), said my family has properties adjoining those properties behind those two homes. I'm compelled to speak tonight on the hypocrisy that I witnessed in your decision-making process last week 7-18-2022. I wish to highlight and implore you to objectively review your conduct on that night. Below is a list of objective observations I made as a consequence of that meeting.

Our attorney, Yolanda Taylor, requested a continuance on 7-17 and it was denied based on the premise that we did not have standing. She expressed our intent to be present at the 7-18 meeting and to prove our standing in regards to Valea Village. The applicant, Valea Bowman, requested a continuance on 7-18 and we were not notified of his request nor given professional courtesy that should have been extended, which resulted in us, our community organization, paying legal fees of 10 plus hours for the attorney.

Attorney Sloop's response was that there was no way to determine the commission's decision to accept his request. It was my determination based on what was said in the meeting there was no path forward without the applicant being present, so regardless there was no way to go but to accept his request.

I was sitting out front and Mr. Solomon from the Plum Creek homeowners' association came in after 6 p.m. and requested to speak. I heard him talking to the welcome hostess out front and he was told that he came in after 6 and time had expired for requesting to speak. I'm not sure what happened after that, but he was allowed to speak and afforded the opportunity to state his standing when the QJ began for Hamlet development, which is adjacent to Plum Creek.

Upon opening the QJ, Mayor Bales did an outstanding job on reading the rules of the QJ, emphasizing the need to have only witnesses with standing and the pros and cons have to be factual, objective, with expert testimony. The Plum Creek HOA was denied standing and reminded that testimony would be allowed, but not be considered as expert witness and could not cross examine witnesses. The matter of adjoining road from Plum Creek to and from their new neighbor was the only objection to the project. It was stated that since the neighborhood was established in 1990 there was never a need for dual access for fire or police to come into the neighborhood and described Plum Creek as very quiet and peaceful. Giving access to their new neighbors could threaten the peace and security of Plum Creek. It was mentioned the attitude of the commission seemed to change, all understood what the objection implied. Though Attorney Sloop objected twice and stated Town Ordinance of 6.1.00.3 says there shall be adjoining streets, not should, the commission voted to eliminate the adjoining road with a barrier and approved the development.

You knowingly and willingly validated your own ordinance because of unsubstantiated fears. I never once heard anyone mention the fact that Plum Creek might need multiple entrances in case of fire or police assistance. These are people moving or what we consider new neighbors. It would definitely threaten the peace and security of their neighborhood. Mr. Solomon objected to his neighbors being allowed to walk to his neighborhood streets and that to me is not being a very welcoming approach.

The community of Pottstown however does not enjoy to year of this commission. We have neither police sergeants, rotary club members, nor the fire department chief living in our boundaries. By the way, I thought it was very unprofessional for the fire and police personnel to sign off on a petition excluding the adjoining road when they are well aware of the existence and intent of the Town ordinance 6.100.3.

There are hard-working, honest people in Pottstown who have come here to beg and plead our commission for peace, safety, and security for years, but they have been ignored. I would ask in the future remove systemic racism, we are speaking of not having equal respect and equal access, the resources this commission can grant. I pray that in the future you will knowingly and willingly do the right thing by all citizens of this community.

AGENDA CHANGES

Commissioner Boone made a motion to adopt the agenda.

Commissioner Partee seconded motion.

Motion carried unanimously.

CONSENT AGENDA

Approval of Minutes. Commissioner Phillips made a motion to adopt the minutes of the May 16, 2022 Regular Town Board Meeting. Commissioner Kidwell seconded motion. Motion carried unanimously.

Call for Public Hearing – Petition #TA22-10. Commissioner Phillips made a motion to call a public hearing for Tuesday, September 6, 2022, at 6:00 p.m. at Huntersville Town Hall on Petition #TA22-10, a request by the Huntersville Planning Department clarifying that single-family detached homes and duplex house types are not permitted on multi-building sites. Commissioner Kidwell seconded motion. Motion carried unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Mayor Bales recognized Planning Board members present: Jeff Sny, Scott Hensley, Frank Gammon, Jodi Wright and Chris Boyd.

Petition #S22-02. Mayor Bales called to order public hearing on Petition #S22-02, Novant Health Special Sign District, a request by Lockwood Identity, Inc. (SignArt) to amend the plan for the Special Sign District Zoning Overlay for Novant Health Hospital located at 10030 Gilead Road, Tax Parcel 01716601.

Kayleigh Mielenz, Planner I, entered the Staff Report into the record and reviewed request. *Refer to Staff Report and Staff PowerPoint attached hereto as Exhibit No. 2.*

There are three options for sign regulation under Article 10 of the Zoning Ordinance. One, adhere to the standard sign regulations detailed in Article 10; (2) utilize the plan development flexibility option; (3) utilize the special sign district option. Novant Health is a part of a special sign district originally approved in 2005 when the facility was named Presbyterian Hospital. Hospitals have complex signage needs and a special sign district was the best option for the site because of the greater flexibility allowed.

Presently SignArt has petitioned to amend the special sign district. They are requesting a 38 sq. ft. wall sign on the exterior canopy of a newly completed addition, which is a picture of the sign right there and then the arrow of course is pointing to the wall where it will go. Not the exact wall because the construction is not done.

In considering the proposed rezoning Petition #S22-02, Novant Health Special Sign District, staff recommends approval based on the policies detailed in the Staff Report. A virtual neighborhood meeting was held July 21. No one from the public attended. The Planning Board is August 23 and Town Board decision is September 19.

There being no questions or comments, Mayor Bales closed the public hearing.

OTHER BUSINESS

Petition #TA22-05. Petition #TA22-05 is a request by the Huntersville Town Board to amend the Subdivision and Zoning Ordinance by changing subdivision sketch plan decisions from a quasi-judicial process (Planning Board recommendation, Town Board decision) to an administrative process (staff decision) including miscellaneous ordinance clean-up adjustments.

Jack Simoneau, entered the Staff Report into the record. *Staff Report and Staff PowerPoint attached hereto as Exhibit No. 3.*

This is to amend the zoning and subdivision ordinance to change major subdivision process from quasi-judicial process to a staff approval administrative process and also some miscellaneous ordinance clean-up adjustments.

In Huntersville there's three steps for subdivision approval. First is a subdivision sketch plan. That is the quasi-judicial decision. The second step is a preliminary plat if the sketch plan is approved. That's a staff approval. The third and final step is final plat where they create the metes and bounds description to be able to sell lots and that is also staff approval.

Our current rules have some subjective standards which because they have some subjective standards we have to follow the quasi-judicial process. We get a subdivision sketch plan application. The developer has a neighborhood meeting. There's a Planning Board recommendation and then there's a Town Board decision.

In your agenda packets, the proposal was to change all the standards to objective standards, so get rid of the subjective standards and just make them recommendations, then we could follow an administrative process, so we still would have the sketch plan application. We would recommend in the Staff Report there be a neighborhood meeting and this could inform citizens as to what's happening around them. There would not be a Planning Board recommendation and the decision as is presented in your Staff Report is for it to be a staff administrative decision. That is following the recommendation of the School of Government that recommends staff approve it since there's no room for policy choices – policy choices are discretion. Having said that, you could have the Planning Board or Town Board approve an administrative process, it doesn't have to be staff. It could be elected officials or the Planning Board. I will mention in your Staff Report there's a recommendation 5-4 the Huntersville Ordinances Advisory Board recommended the change as proposed. However, as Mr. Sny noted earlier, the Planning Board did recommend unanimously to keep the quasi-judicial process that we currently have, so not change that but just make the clean-up changes that were on an attachment that was included in your agenda packet.

I do want to point out seven different requests being processed now. What we need to keep in mind is if we make a change tonight, we have multiple applications that are in process and using the state statute there's something called permit choice. If rules change while a development is being processed, the developer has a choice to follow the new rules or stay with the old rules. If we do decide to make any changes from what's in the agenda packet, so if we do administrative but it just go to Town Board, or if we did administrative it go to the Planning Board, or if we keep it quasi-judicial and go to the Board of Adjustment, we will need to make changes throughout the Subdivision Ordinance and some Zoning Ordinance changes and we will need to readvertise.

Commissioner Phillips said can you guys clarify with the current quasi-judicial what is considered an expert, a technical expert and what is a person with legal interest in the subject property.

Ms. Sloop said and it depends on what they are trying to testify about. For example, what we frequently see is someone who wants to come and speak about property values. That could require a licensed appraiser who is licensed in North Carolina to provide that type of testimony. That's required by statute. It's also required by statute when someone is coming to speak about traffic and the impact of traffic on safety that per statute also requires an expert. It really depends on what it is that they are

trying to testify about as to who would be qualified as an expert. We always have to have the foundation laid to determine whether or not that person is actually an expert. As far as standing, it would be the property owner, the applicant who is applying for whatever development regulation approval is at stake, the Town Board and also it would be someone who can prove that they would suffer special damages if the application were approved.

Commissioner Kidwell said we've heard a lot about making this administrative. I kind of equate that to before I met my wife, online dating. I would go there and say I'm looking for somebody who is this, this and this and if they met those checkmarks and we got matched and I sent a like to her or if she sent like to me, we go on a date and see if we were compatible and I will tell you everyone of them were a no. It just wasn't going to happen. If we send this process to the administration level like that, it's the same thing, except they can now say you met all the checkmarks, you pass. It's like an arranged marriage. Why do we want to do that to the people of this town. We are going to take what little voice they have on by-right projects away. We are going to force a marriage with a developer that gives them no opportunity to speak. We saw the benefit of that with the project off of Jim Kidd Road where one guy said I'm concerned that they are going to build these million dollar houses right by my house. I'm going to go out my back door where I've been able to look at trees and pastures and I'm just going to see a back of a house now. They said we can work with you on that. It's just a sliver now. Some of my fellow board members will call it false hope, we're giving the people false hope that they can go up there and change it. It is the process that most of the by-right projects that come before us are going to pass, but I don't call it false hope. I call it the ability to allow the people to talk and it gives them the opportunity to sway the developer even in the slightest that may benefit a neighbor, because most of our developers want to be a good neighbor. Most, not all, say that and by keeping it non-administrative, it gives us that opportunity to leverage. It gives the people a voice and I don't think we need to take that away and force a marriage down their throats. I personally would like to see this go to the Board of Adjustment. The Board of Adjustment handles mostly all quasi-judicial anyway. I've watched as they have navigated some difficult ones in the past and some easy ones in the past and we've put qualified individuals on that board to make those decisions in the past and I'm sure we'll do it in the future. It might not be a popular opinion with the rest of the Board members and that's fine, but I would say let's not remove what little voice an individual has or a neighborhood has, so they have the ability to speak, otherwise a developer is going to walk into Planning staff, meet all their qualifications, it gets rubber stamped and no one has a say. And that's wrong. We have to look out beyond the what's easy for the Board because no one up here likes quasi-judicial. There's not a person up here except maybe the Mayor who loves reading from her 3-ring binder for 17 minutes on the rules and processes which literally will put my baby to sleep. But seriously let's not jump to the administrative level, let's put this on the Board of Adjustment and it still gives us the opportunity to talk to the public, it gives the public to go in front of that board and let them say this is what I feel and that board who has done a great job in the past will continue to do a good job saying we understand that, the developer may say we hear you, we'll make conditions on that, and it will still get approved. I think they have only denied one or two in the history of anything going in front of them and I believe that was just variances. I implore my fellow commissioners to think about that as we move forward on this decision and I know that we all don't agree on that and that's okay. I respect you guys' point of view on that, I strongly feel that this is the right thing to do is to move it to Board of Adjustment.

Commissioner Munger said for by-right projects that currently come to the Planning Department, have you ever had the opportunity to request from the applicant some minor deviation for what they are trying to build and put together.

Mr. Simoneau said the answer to that is yes. When we review a plan there are things that we would say we would recommend you do that. We make it very clear it's a recommendation and we make it very clear what's a requirement because some developers are willing to make adjustments and if we can make a better plan, great. It is our job to make sure that the applicant knows very clearly on these page after page of designs this is what we would recommend you do, this is what you must do.

Commissioner Munger said typically it's probably hard to cite specific numbers but do they generally are they open to those changes or those recommendations that you have made.

Mr. Simoneau said I'll just say it depends. Some are.

Commissioner Munger said one of the other questions I have is specific to LU-11.1, protect existing housing stock. How does Planning staff go about evaluating whether or not that policy is upheld.

Mr. Simoneau said 11.1, I'll give you an example of the rental home community that we had just recently come before the Town Board. When that plan first came in, it had its density spread throughout the development including up against Plum Creek. We advised them that the Board has language in the subjective standards that the Board can approve development that's most beneficial to that adjoining property. That's part of that objective standard. We recommended that they reduce the density, the number of units that are next to the border of Plum Creek. In addition, we recommended a larger buffer than the 20'. In the end when it came before this Board, it was a 50' buffer, they had a solid fence that they were putting up which I think was part of a negotiation with the homeowners during their neighborhood meetings and they reduced the density down of those units. We were able in our minds to say now you are trying to protect that adjoining community.

Commissioner Munger said I'm glad you brought up that specific subdivision. Hypothetically and hopefully I'm not going too far off base, had this decision already been finalized six months ago and the Hamlet came to the Planning Department, because it wouldn't have come to quasi-judicial at that point since it was a subdivision change, correct.

Mr. Simoneau said correct.

Commissioner Munger said would we have ended with the same result and if not, what would have changed.

Mr. Simoneau said it's hard to think about what would change, but I will tell you they would not have been required to do more than 20' and they would not have been required to reduce the density along that border. Our notes on the plan would have been we recommend you do this, but it would be just a recommendation, not a requirement. I would dare say in that case it would be less likely we'd see what we got.

Commissioner Munger said LU-11.1 does not give you the specific power to say because this would change the existing housing stock in the surrounding communities, we not just recommend, I don't know how else to put it, but demand that a further buffer be established.

Mr. Simoneau said the answer to that question is we could not require that. That's if I'm getting to where I think you are wanting me to do. Let's go actually to the Subdivision Ordinance language so you got this in your agenda packet. There's a lot of pages. If you look at No. 2 Conformity, the way the rule is written today it says all proposed subdivisions shall be planned to facilitate the most advantageous

development of the entire neighboring area. That is really subjective. That puts it in the quasi-judicial process. When we go to administrative, we've got to change that shall to a should. You should do this. Would they be required, no. Would we advise them to do, yes.

Commissioner Munger said the issue I have really comes down to that shall. If we don't follow our own ordinances when we do a quasi-judicial hearing, it is my fear that we open ourselves up to greater liability and specifically to that end the Hamlet shall connect. We didn't. That to me is problematic. I don't know, this one you have no idea how long I struggled. For me and to Commissioner Kidwell, I'm the guy. I'm the one that said false hope. Every time I have someone come up on a quasi-judicial matter, I can't talk about it. They look at you and they implore you and they just want to drive home that point that this is going to affect me directly. From a quasi-judicial perspective, we must look at it in legal black and white. To go beyond that scope is to shirk our duties and so anyone that would say that we are shirking our duties by shifting this back to administrative, it's clear it gives people the understanding that it is an administrative function because if you do it as a quasi-judicial function, it gives people the idea that maybe we can skirt around a lot. You really can't, you open yourself up to future liability. You have to pay attention to the laws and one of the things that I would implore us to do is to look at our existing ordinances and identify where are we running short. Where does it make sense that we should change things. Quasi-judicial is false hope. I don't know how else to put it.

Commissioner Partee said I can understand the intimidation factor of trying to preside over a quasi-judicial proceeding and just not speaking for myself, I know you were talking about other commissioners, I'm not intimidated by the judicial process having presented hundreds of criminal cases before a court, giving testimony in pre-trial, evidentiary, suppression hearings, testifying as an expert witness, which I understand that you have to be an expert and certified by the courts and also a certified interviewer and interrogator. It's a learning process to sit before our residents and stand in judgment over them. It's intimidating. You can't think about your next election. You've got to think about how you are going to serve the residents of Huntersville. As an elected official I take responsibility for my position. What I do have issues with is giving a civilian committee the authority and the power over Town Board and that's unacceptable to me. However we decide today I'm not in favor of giving it to the Board of Adjustment. It's just not possible and it should not be even our mindset to empower a committee with such authority.

Commissioner Boone said when I ran for office I knew what the job was. It says quasi-judicial. If you want to run for the Board, that's going to be part of your job. Now when nobody likes it, we're going to take our responsibility and sluff it off onto somebody else. That's not acceptable to me. That is my responsibility to sit here and listen to the evidence. As far as the Board of Adjustment is concerned that is probably the worst idea that we would come up with. You talk about legal fees in the future, it would be enormous. And I can just bring back a case that was last year with the Board of Adjustment, I think it was with a SWIM buffer and to approve a swim buffer you have to make four points and the chairperson of the Board of Adjustment said they only made three, but they went ahead and approved the SWIM buffer. But the point is that the Assistant Town Attorney was in the meeting and he said you can't approve this unless they have all four of the qualifications met and another member of the Board of Adjustment said you are not the Board of Adjustment attorney and the Board of Adjustment went ahead and approved that and that just shows that would open up a legal end for anybody else and I am absolutely for keeping it in my responsibility in my scope of work because that's what I ran on and that's what I'm going to continue to do.

Commissioner Kovacs said I am of the mindset that I do think it should go to the Board of Adjustment because it is what they do commonly in the way that they practice and I'm also of the mindset that if we are worried about litigation, staying with the Town Board is not the way to go to stop that. At our last quasi-judicial, I believe some information was stated that was not provided in packets and that right there could be something that opens us up to litigation. I have a motion prepared whenever we are ready.

Commissioner Phillips said I hate quasi-judicial, and I think it's the worst part of this job because not everybody operates under the purview of it in the same manner. People interpret how they operate under quasi-judicial. I personally get so freaked out that I'm going to get in trouble that if I even suspect an email is quasi-judicial in matter, I will forward it to our Town Attorney and have her read it before I will ever read it because I don't want to do the wrong thing. I take this job more seriously than I take anything in my life and it's an honor to get to sit up here, but it's also my job to communicate with the 60,000+ people we represent in this town. I hate when people say I sent you an email and I'm like I'm sorry, I can't read it. I'm sorry we can't talk about this. There are times where I would just love to say I'm so sorry y'all are going through this because black and white is what quasi-judicial is, but there still needs to be a human component to this stuff for the Board and I'm rambling a lot because I feel like I've talked about how much this process stinks for three years. When we have a mother who is not considered an expert in her child's safety and we can't listen to her speak, that has stuck with me through this process. It will always stick with me through this process. When we have School of Government saying you guys need to go this way because you are getting into some troublesome waters, you need to listen. School of Government is not a joke and if they are the same people that provide our Ethics Training and all these other things, we adhere to them on everything else that we do for the most part, why would we not listen to them on a legal matter as well.

Commissioner Kovacs made a motion in considering Petition #TA22-05, motion to amend the Subdivision and Zoning Ordinances by removing the quasi-judicial process from Planning Board recommendation and Town Board decision and assign the Board of Adjustment these decisions without input from other boards or committees and include these changes with the edits in Attachment 8 of the packet.

Commissioner Kidwell seconded motion.

Mr. Simoneau said I had to change it to 9 but it's the one that has all of the minor changes to the text amendment.

Commissioner Kovacs said Attachment 9, I wrote this for last week's meeting.

Commissioner Kidwell seconded motion

Commissioner Munger made a substitute motion in considering the proposed amendment #TA22-05, the Town Board recommends approval based on the amendment being consistent with Policies LU-1, LU-2, LU-3 and LU-4 of the Huntersville 2040 Community Plan. It is reasonable and in the public interest to amend the Zoning Ordinance because the Town Board has determined that subdivision sketch plans should be considered under an administrative process as opposed to a quasi-judicial process.

Commissioner Phillips seconded motion.

Mayor Bales called for the vote on the substitute motion.

Motion was tied 3 to 3 (Commissioners Munger, Partee and Phillips in favor; Commissioners Boone, Kidwell and Kovacs opposed).

Mayor Bales said it's 3 to 3 and the motion on the floor is the motion that is recommended in the packet to change quasi-judicial from the Town Board to an administrative process. I have given this one a lot of thought over the last year because we have been discussing this off and on for a long time now. I am of the opinion that quasi-judicial does leave our citizens with a void in the inability to talk to commissioners and it does make more sense to shift that process to administrative. I agree with some things that I have heard this evening in regards to mitigating risks for our community. Ensuring that our community is protected from a legal perspective is very important. I think 72 percent of municipalities in the state of North Carolina use the administrative process and there's a reason for that. My vote this evening will be for this motion, the administrative motion.

Recognize Juneteenth as Holiday. Lara Cagle said this item is a follow-up to the Board action earlier this year to recognize Juneteenth as a holiday at the Board level and subsequent discussions around making it an official holiday for all town employees.

Commissioner Partee made a motion to add Juneteenth as an annual staff holiday starting on Monday, June 19, 2023.

Commissioner Phillips seconded motion.

Commissioner Kidwell said I would like to thank Commissioner Boone for putting this in front of us at the beginning of the year knowing that the federal had made it a holiday and it's only right.

Motion carried unanimously.

MAYOR AND COMMISSIONER REPORTS/CLOSING COMMENTS

Mayor Bales

- Lake Norman Economic Development Corporation (LNEDC) has launched a new app to provide updates. LNEDC is working with the Education Collaborative on connecting businesses and schools together.
- Provided update from the Metropolitan Transit Commission. The last meeting was an information session on advancing the 2030 transit plan Connect Beyond.
- Huntersville has a new Podcast.
- Mecklenburg County community level of high in regards to COVID.

Commissioner Phillips

- Provided update from Visit Lake Norman.

Commissioner Partee

- Attended Greenway, Trails and Bikeway Commission. Next meeting is August 16.
- Huntersville Police Department has free gun safety locks.
- Bring awareness to Cool Kids Clubhouse.

Commissioner Munger

- Next Huntersville Ordinances Advisory Board meeting is August 4.
- Next Public Arts Commission meeting is August 9.
- Consider supporting local non-profits.

Commissioner Kidwell

- Provided update from the Charlotte Regional Transportation Planning Organization.

Commissioner Kovacs

- Provided update from the Lake Norman Chamber of Commerce.

Commissioner Boone

- Huntersville Police Department will have their National Night out in October.

Commissioner Phillips noted the 2-year anniversary of the Colonial Pipeline spill is coming up. Colonial Pipeline is welcome to come to Huntersville Town Hall at any time and give an update to the public.

Mayor Bales said I'm actually meeting with them on Wednesday to discuss just that.

Commissioner Munger said I would like to apologize to this Board, Town staff and the people of the Town of Huntersville for not being in attendance at our last meeting. I think one of the things that I learned from watching that meeting is that we have a dire need to reinstate the 3 on 3's and to allow all Board members, including myself, to work out details and get needed information prior to the actual Town Board meeting. I know it sometimes sounds like an oxymoron, but I do believe in government efficiency and bringing back the 3-on-3's will help push us in that direction. If some Board members do not wish to attend, that can be their individual choice, but I would argue that we can all benefit from these meetings.

Commissioner Kovacs expressed appreciation to fellow commissioners for approving traffic calming measures on Greenway Drive and to the crews for installing them.

Commissioner Partee expressed appreciation to his granddaughter for attending the meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

Approved this the 6th day of September 2022.