

Meeting Minutes  
September 24, 2025

MINUTES OF MECKLENBURG COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA  
BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

The Board of Commissioners of Mecklenburg County, North Carolina, met in Budget/Public Policy Session in Conference Center Room 267 on the 2nd floor of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center located at 600 East Fourth Street, Charlotte, North Carolina at 2:30 p.m. on Wednesday, September 24, 2025.

ATTENDANCE

**Present:** Vice-Chair Leigh Altman  
and Commissioners Arthur Griffin,  
Laura J. Meier, Vilma D. Leake,  
Yvette Townsend-Ingram, and  
Susan Rodriguez-McDowell  
County Manager Michael Bryant  
County Attorney Tyrone C. Wade  
Clerk to the Board Kristine M. Smith  
Deputy Clerk to the Board Arlissa Eason

**Absent:** Chair Mark Jerrell  
Commissioner Elaine Powell  
Commissioner George Dunlap

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Vice-Chair Leigh Altman, followed by introductions and the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

25-0524                      Comprehensive Plan for Unincorporated Mecklenburg County

The Board received information regarding the planning process for the Comprehensive Plan for Unincorporated Mecklenburg County (CPUSM).

*Background: The CPSUM fulfills the state's legal requirement to provide land use guidance for the area. The zoning authority for the area in question falls within Mecklenburg's jurisdiction. Because of the interlocal agreement between Mecklenburg County and the City of Charlotte, the County must apply the City of Charlotte's zoning requirement to the area in question.*

Erin Stanforth, Sustainability and Resiliency Manager, and Maria Floren, Planning Project Manager, with the City of Charlotte, gave the presentation.

# CPUSM COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR UNINCORPORATED SOUTH MECKLENBURG



Mecklenburg County BOCC Public Policy Meeting  
Wednesday, September 24, 2025

CPUSM COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR UNINCORPORATED SOUTH MECKLENBURG

## Project Summary



- **Legal Requirement:**
  - This project fulfills the state’s legal requirement to provide land use guidance for this area.
- **Process:**
  - The effort began in the spring and has included opportunities for public engagement throughout the process.
  - We are now in the final phase of the project, where the draft plan is being finalized for review.
- **Next Steps:**
  - Once complete, the plan will need to be reviewed & adopted by the Mecklenburg County Board of County Commissioners (BOCC).

CPUSM COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR UNINCORPORATED SOUTH MECKLENBURG


## Overview

- Joint effort with Mecklenburg County & City of Charlotte to develop **future land use guidance (Place Types)** for the project area.
- **Legal requirement in NC:**

*North Carolina Law Chapter 160D, Article 5*  
“As a condition of adopting and applying zoning regulations under this Chapter, a local government shall adopt and reasonably maintain a comprehensive plan or land-use plan.”



## Location



CPUSM COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR  
UNINCORPORATED SOUTH MECKLENBURG

## Project Schedule

| SPRING                                                                                                                                                           | JUNE - JULY                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | AUGUST                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          | SEPTEMBER - DECEMBER                                                                                                                                                                     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>PRE-PLANNING</b><br>                                                       | <b>PHASE 1<br/>ENGAGEMENT</b><br>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | <b>PHASE 2<br/>ENGAGEMENT</b><br>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | <b>REVIEW &amp;<br/>ADOPTION</b><br>                                                                |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Project development &amp; coordination</li><li>• Review of existing entitlements</li><li>• Mapping Methodology</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Public outreach</li><li>• Community Meetings<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>◦ Education &amp; Methodology</li><li>◦ Review Translated Place Types Map</li><li>◦ Place Type Discussions</li><li>◦ Accept feedback</li></ul></li><li>• Place Types Map Refinement<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>◦ Review community feedback</li><li>◦ Mapping revisions</li></ul></li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Community Meetings<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>◦ Education &amp; Methodology</li><li>◦ Review Future Place Types Map</li><li>◦ Review feedback</li><li>◦ Accept feedback</li></ul></li><li>• Place Types Map Refinement<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>◦ Review feedback</li><li>◦ Mapping revisions</li></ul></li><li>• Develop Project Brief</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Mecklenburg County review &amp; adoption process</li></ul>  |

CPUSM COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR  
UNINCORPORATED SOUTH MECKLENBURG

## How is the map developed?

- Step 1     **Translated existing zoning districts** to the most equivalent Place Type.
- Step 2     **Reviewed conditions** that may warrant a revision to other Place Types with the community. **Developed final recommendations.**
- Step 3     Recommendations will be **reviewed and adopted** by Mecklenburg County Board of County Commissioners.







What are  
Place Types?

Place Types are a new  
classification system to organize  
patterns of development.

- They do **NOT** change zoning districts.
- They are more **holistic and comprehensive** than typical land use guidance.



Place Types



Future Land Use (Place Types) v. Zoning

| PLACE TYPES                                                       | ZONING                                                       |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| Vision for future development or redevelopment                    | Tool to implement the vision                                 |
| Recommendations for range of land uses and building forms         | Legal development standards + requirements                   |
| Community Participation                                           | Staff Administration                                         |
| Community Plans                                                   | Zoning Ordinance                                             |
| Guidance: referenced via rezonings or capital investment planning | Law: administered during development approval and permitting |

*If someone wants to rezone their property, they must apply for a rezoning. Staff and officials will use the adopted Place Types to help decide whether to approve or deny the rezoning request.*



To recap...


- Place Types do **NOT** change zoning districts or existing uses.
- Place Types provide **guidance for future land use (types of development appropriate in the future)**
- If someone wants to change their zoning district in the future, they would need to apply for a rezoning, and staff and officials would refer to the adopted Place Types to **help inform their decisions on whether to deny or approve a request.**

PHASE 1  
OVERVIEW

ZONING  
MAP

Existing Zoning:

- R-3
- R-5
- R-20MF
- R-MH
- UR-2(CD)
- NS
- BD(CD)





## ZONING TO PLACE TYPES TRANSLATION

Existing uses and zoning districts translated to Place Types:

- R-3, R5, R-20MF, R-MH translated to **Neighborhood 1**
- UR-2(CD) translated to **Neighborhood 2**
- B-D(CD) translated to **Manufacturing & Logistics**
- NS translated to **Neighborhood Activity Center**

*Established neighborhoods are respected and mapped as Neighborhood 1.*

### FOCUS AREAS

1. **Manufacturing & Logistics** on Lancaster Highway
2. **Neighborhood Center** on Lancaster Highway
3. **Harrison United Methodist Church** at Lancaster Highway & Providence Road


**LEGEND**

- CPUSM Boundary
- Parcels
- Streets
- Neighborhood 1
- Neighborhood 2
- Parks & Preserves
- Commercial
- Campus
- Manufacturing & Logistics
- Innovation Mixed-Use
- Neighborhood Center
- Community Activity Center
- Regional Activity Center

0 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5 Miles

**CPUSM** COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR UNINCORPORATED SOUTH MECKLENBURG

## Phase 1 Feedback Summary



\* All comments and responses are available to view on the project website.







Key Dates

|              |                                                         |       |
|--------------|---------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| Sep. 24      | Mecklenburg County BOCC: Public Policy Meeting          | TODAY |
| Oct. 20      | Draft Plan Release                                      |       |
| Oct. 21      | Mecklenburg County BOCC: Request for Public Hearing     |       |
| Nov. 5       | Mecklenburg County BOCC: Public Hearing                 |       |
| Nov. 18      | Charlotte Mecklenburg Planning Committee Recommendation |       |
| Dec. 2 or 16 | Mecklenburg County BOCC: Adoption Decision              |       |

*\*All dates are tentative*

  
  
[engage.mecknc.gov/southmeckplan](https://engage.mecknc.gov/southmeckplan)

CPUSM

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR  
UNINCORPORATED  
SOUTH MECKLENBURG

Comments

Commissioner Rodriguez-McDowell asked if the mention of it being non-regulatory meant it was not a rezoning at that point. *Ms. Floren said yes, it was for future guidance to inform future rezonings.* Commissioner Rodriguez-McDowell asked why they were waiting to release the draft plan. *Ms. Floren said they were drafting a project brief that was being developed and outlined the whole process. She said it would be released on the 20<sup>th</sup>.* Commissioner Rodriguez-McDowell asked if it was going to change from what they had been presented. *Ms. Floren said no.* Commissioner Rodriguez-McDowell asked if they could move the request for a hearing sooner. *Ms. Floren said the plan was to have the plan released for people to have comments.*

Commissioner Rodriguez-McDowell said there were people waiting, and it seemed like a long timeline. She asked them to speak about access to utilities in any parts that were already developed. *Ms. Floren said it was only related to land use, and they were not looking at public services.*

Commissioner Townsend-Ingram thanked them. She asked in reference to regularities, could the General Assembly tell them what they could and couldn't do. *Ms. Stanforth said the plan*

## Meeting Minutes

### September 24, 2025

*fulfilled a requirement they had with 160D since the area was out of compliance. Ms. Floren said that any pending rezonings at the time couldn't move forward until the plan was adopted.*

Commissioner Townsend-Ingram asked if there was a way to measure whether there would be any disparities. She asked if funding was tied to any of the allocated zones and if the pros and cons were presented to the people during the meetings. *Kathy Cornett, Planning Division Manager, said that typically, the plans didn't commit any funding; they were more streamlined. She said there was an implementation plan that wasn't adopted because it didn't commit any funding. She said 160D was adopted in July 2021, and they had been complying, but it said they had to have a comprehensive plan document. She said they had to have that policy to have the regulatory component.*

Commissioner Leake said her concern was rezoning because there was a problem with infrastructure. She asked if they had talked about bringing in more communities into the County. *Ms. Floren said they documented all of the responses they received from the community and that she could provide the information.* Commissioner Leake asked what some of the concerns were. *Maria said Increased density was one of them.* Commissioner Leake stated she was talking about growth in the City, which overflowed into the County. She asked how they were going to adjust to the correction of growth. *Ms. Stanforth reiterated that the plan kept them in compliance and did not advocate for a particular kind of zone. Holly Cramer, Planning Program Manager, said that once the map was in place, if a developer came in proposing a multi-family development, for example, and the area was committed to neighborhood 1, they would ask what criteria were being met.*

Commissioner Griffin said 160D was for governmental bodies and entities. He asked if the plot of land was not included for 24 years, because it seemed like they were playing the City Council's role. He asked where Pineville was in the situation. *County Attorney Wade said Pineville wasn't included; it was a small piece of incorporated land in the County, and for any rezoning, there needed to be a plan.* Commissioner Griffin said they needed to investigate more about the role and asked if others wanted to develop on that plot of land; they would have to come to them. *County Attorney Wade said they would have to make a request to the Board. He said it was what was done in the past; there just wasn't a plan in place.*

Commissioner Griffin said it was going to be interesting. He asked if they were talking about the 2040 plan and UDO, which were already in policy with the City, and if they were going to adopt their policy overlay. *County Attorney Wade said no, and that was why they presented it to the Board on just that small portion of land, so the Board could react and create a plan for rezoning.*

Commissioner Meier asked Commissioner Rodriguez-McDowell if she was hearing from her residents. Commissioner Rodriguez-McDowell said yes, and on slide 12, she said there was very little land that wasn't built out, and that they wouldn't make many decisions on this based on the map.

Commissioner Griffin said he was concerned about a developer's plans to do something different with that property. Commissioner Rodriguez-McDowell asked if he was referring to removing the homes that were already there. Commissioner Griffin said yes. Commissioner Rodriguez-McDowell said it would have to come back to the Board, *to which County Attorney Wade agreed.*

Commissioner Townsend-Ingram asked if they had anything in play to measure benefits and whether they were being zoned one way over another. *Ms. Stanforth said if someone wanted to rezone, they couldn't because there wasn't a plan in place. Ms. Floren said, similar to engagement within the City, they looked at sites and focus areas together and reviewed zoning and land use. She said they got the opinions of the community.*

Commissioner Leake asked who brought the issue to the County. *County Attorney Wade said there was a request for a church to rezone; this was the plan, and without it, they couldn't do it because the statute had changed.* Commissioner Leake said she would be concerned with the



Meeting Minutes  
September 24, 2025

political impact it would have on the County. County Attorney Wade said there wouldn't be any.

25-0494                      2025 Employee Climate Survey Results

The Board received information on the county's annual employee climate survey.

*Background: Each year, the County’s Strategy & Innovation team administers its annual Employee Climate Survey (ECS) to all full-time and part-time employees. The ECS results are used to evaluate performance on the County’s Corporate Scorecard, as well as understand the perceptions employees have about working for and within Mecklenburg County Government. These perceptions are important to know, because they constitute the level of motivation and satisfaction among employees.*

Michael Griswold, Director of the Office of Strategy and Innovation, gave the presentation.



## Survey Overview and Methodology

### Purpose

- Assess employee motivation and satisfaction (11 measures) and employee development (5 measures).
- Assess progress toward performance management goals aligned to corporate and departmental strategy.
- Identify employee perceptions of business support services.
- General sentiments from employees.

### Methodology

- Administered online using Qualtrics software from April 23 through May 14, 2025.
- Assessed both corporate items and various department-specific questions.
- Majority of the results shown reflect the percent of respondents that select “agree / strongly agree” or “yes” (unless otherwise specified).

### Timeline

Feb - Mar

Apr - Jun

Jul – Sep

- Initiate
- Discover
- Plan

- Launch
- Clean
- Analyze

- Develop
- Deliver
- Act


3

## Engagement Efforts


- OSI provided Department Directors with an ECS Communications Toolkit.
- The Toolkit included OSI's outreach timeline, email templates for reminders, and key messaging examples.

|                                                       | Date                | Communication Channel        | Message Type                                                                                 |
|-------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Building Survey Awareness and Promoting Participation | Thursday, March 6   | Employee News Now            | Initial "heads up" message introducing survey awareness.                                     |
|                                                       | Wednesday, March 19 | Employee News Now            | Continued survey awareness messaging to maintain visibility.                                 |
|                                                       | Thursday, April 3   | Employee News Now            | Ongoing survey awareness updates.                                                            |
|                                                       | Monday, April 7     | County Manager Message       | Communication with department directors, sharing previous response rates and survey details. |
|                                                       | Wednesday, April 16 | Employee News Now            | Reminder before the survey launch.                                                           |
|                                                       | Monday, April 21    | Your County Manager/ MeckWeb | Final reminders before the survey launch.                                                    |
| Survey Launch and Follow-Up Communications            | Wednesday, April 23 | ENN/MeckWeb                  | Official announcement of the survey launch with details.                                     |
|                                                       | Thursday, May 1     | Employee News Now            | First reminder to encourage participation.                                                   |
|                                                       | Wednesday, May 7    | Employee News Now            | Second reminder highlighting the final week to take the survey.                              |
|                                                       | Monday, May 12      | Your County Manager          | Reminder focusing on the final days of survey participation.                                 |
|                                                       | Wednesday, May 14   | Employee News Now            | "Last Call" reminder for the final day to take the survey.                                   |
| Post Survey Communications                            | Thursday, May 15    | Your County Manager          | Thank-you message from County Manager, outlining the results sharing timeline.               |
|                                                       | Mid-September       | Employee News Now            | Announcement of dashboard release with quantitative survey results.                          |
|                                                       | Late-September      | Employee News Now            | Reminder on how to access and review the results dashboard.                                  |


## Response Rates



## Survey vs. County Staff Demographics




## Survey vs. County Staff Demographics



# Countywide Results




## FY25 Motivation & Satisfaction Index Results



9

## Motivation & Satisfaction Index Results Trend

Employee satisfaction with Mecklenburg County overall has remained consistently high for over a decade and a half.




10

## Motivation & Satisfaction Index Compared to National Satisfaction Results

Mecklenburg County employee satisfaction has been on average 31 percentage points greater compared to national results over the last three years.

Motivation & Satisfaction “Strongly Agree” Results Compared to Gallup National Survey “Extremely Satisfied” Results\*



\*Results are narrowed to “Strongly Agree” for comparability to Gallup national “Extremely Satisfied” results.


[Global Indicator: Employee Engagement - Gallup](#)

11

## Perceptions of the BOCC

*“The Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) values County employees.”*

Countywide Agreement,  
FY21 – FY25



### Strengths

- +12-point improvement from FY24.
- Appreciation for Board’s continued value and support of employees.
- Commitment to Residents – Strong Leadership.

### Opportunities

- Lack of clarity about Board roles and responsibilities / Don’t know who they are.
- Concern about the BOCC’s lack of awareness of conditions on the frontline (i.e., increasing demand for services, working conditions, cost of living, etc.).


12

## Employee Awareness of the Board of County Commissioners


*“The Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) values County employees”*

About a third of employees under five years tenure and a little under a third of front-line employees don’t know if the BOCC values County staff.

"Don't Know" Responses by Position Level



"Don't Know" by Length of Service




13

## Perceptions of Workload

*“My workload is reasonable.”*

Countywide Agreement, FY21 – FY25




### Strengths

- +4-point improvement since FY24, highest agreement in five years.

### Opportunities

- Some described workload as chronically demanding and emotionally taxing.
- Concerns include understaffing, poor retention, unequal workload distribution, and process inefficiencies.

14



### Perceptions of Employee Development

#### Countywide



#### Strengths


- High levels of agreement across all index questions suggest that employee development is a consistently strong area for Mecklenburg County.
- **90%** of respondents believe they can develop professionally within Mecklenburg County, highest agreement in five years.
- Generally, employees feel supported by their supervisors, value training, cross-training, active mentorship.



#### Opportunities

- Concerns about limited advancement pathways without turnover.
- Training access and relevance vary across departments, affecting skill growth opportunities.
- Development needs identified for supervisors include coaching, delegating stretch assignments, and career planning skills.

16





## Perceptions of Safety & Security

Countywide


### Strengths

- Majority of employees feel safe at work.
- Highest confidence during business hours, both on-site and when traveling to/from vehicles.
- Awareness of safety resources has significantly improved, with a **+14-point increase** since FY23.

### Opportunities

- Confidence decreases after hours, particularly around workplace security and vehicle access.
- Employees seek more consistent safety protocols and visible safeguards across roles and locations.
- Key focus areas include customer-facing roles and those who work in the field.

## Most Prevalent Positive Qualitative Themes



### Leaders: Department Director

- Employees applauded their directors for transparency, strong leadership, and inclusive decision making.

### Team Dynamics

- Employees mentioned valuing their teammates and the positive impact of having supportive colleagues.

### Valued Employees

- Positive comments centered around employees feeling valued by their team, their department leadership, and/or County Enterprise leadership.

### Morale

- Employees expressed enjoying their time and work with Mecklenburg County.

## Most Prevalent Negative Qualitative Themes

### Telework Policy

- Employees expressed their concerns over the changes to the telework policy that have occurred in recent years.

### Workload


- Employees mentioned excessive and/or misaligned work demands.

### Valued Employees

- Negative comments centered around employees feeling unseen and undervalued by their department leadership and/or County Enterprise leadership.

### Compensation

- Comments related to dissatisfaction with pay.



# Next Steps

21

## Strategic Focus Areas for Organizational Improvement

*Identified through analysis of ECS responses*



22

## Future of the Employee Climate Survey



### The Employee Climate Survey is due for a change!


- 2025 was the 23<sup>rd</sup> annual ECS
- ECS indices have largely been the same for over 10 years
- The ECS has faced scope creep and question inflation

### The Office of Strategy & Innovation (OSI) will:

- Pause the ECS and holistically reevaluate the survey, purpose, and process
- Partner with Human Resources to incorporate questions related to the County’s culture framework (currently under development)
- Launch a reimagined survey in Fall 2026

23

**Meeting Minutes**  
**September 24, 2025**



**Comments**

Commissioner Meier thanked him. She gave a shoutout to Public Information (PI) for addressing the issue of knowing who the Commissioners were to the employees. She asked if the structure of things was part of employee orientation. *County Manager Bryant said it wasn't part of the employee orientation at the time, but would be something they would look into.* Commissioner Meier asked when teleworking stopped. *County Manager Bryant said it ended on July 1, 2024, and they heard their employees loud and clear, and they were looking into things.*

Commissioner Griffin said, referring to slide 13, that employees who have been with the County more than 10 years caught his attention. He said he also appreciated PI and their efforts. *Mr. Griswold said that while they highlighted the newer folks, it was an "all of the above" approach to capture them when they come to show the distinction behind leadership, and the work being put forth by PI could also help.*

Commissioner Leake thanked him. She said she hoped that in the future, as County Commissioners, they would know what they could and couldn't do. She was concerned about the support staff with the Commissioners and wanted to see how far they could go with them. She said she was excited about the Manager and thanked him for his leadership and commitment to the County.

Commissioner Townsend-Ingram also thanked PI and other staff. On slide 9, she asked why, if all were at 90%, why the last two were skewed under 88%. *Mr. Griswold said they took each line as its own, and although they were lower, they were right on target.* Commissioner Townsend-Ingram asked if the employees who didn't work in the building had any suggestions on what they could do. *Mr. Griswold said yes, it would be more helpful to see the Commissioners, but there was nothing at a level where they should call it out as a theme.*

Commissioner Rodriguez-McDowell underlined that they were doing an outside survey and asked if it would be similar. *County Manager Bryant said it took a deeper dive and complements the one presented. He said they would factor the feedback to see what the desired culture was of the County. He said they wanted to make sure there was alignment. He said next year's survey would be delayed until Fall so they could get all the information and come up with strategies and actions to foster the desired culture.* Commissioner Rodriguez-McDowell said she noticed they were getting more invites to events, such as with Park and Recreation, and



**Meeting Minutes**  
**September 24, 2025**

encouraged more departments to invite them to events.

*County Manager Bryant said he appreciated their feedback on how PI was performing.*

Vice Chair Altman asked on slide five if the lowest metric was with the Sheriff's office. *Mr. Griswold said yes.* Vice Chair Altman asked if it should be there since it was dragging down the results. *County Manager Bryant said that was a good observation.* Vice Chair Altman said, with the response "referring others to Mecklenburg County as a great place to work," and elsewhere, there was a reference to dissatisfaction with pay, and public service being paid less than the private sector. She said it would be important to drill down in future surveys to see the source of that weakness. *County Manager Bryant said they were working with HR to develop a new classification compensation strategy that would be responsive to some of that feedback as well.*

Vice Chair Altman said she was interested in the response of "most days I feel good about coming to work" and how that differed from any other employer. She asked County Manager Bryant if he was comfortable referencing telework and if he was comfortable sharing his views on telework. *County Manager Bryant said resetting the organizational culture took time. He said he had conversations with his executive team, and there were more conversations to occur. He said they would not be shifting to teleworking in the near future. He said the younger generation would be the leaders of tomorrow and recognized that when it came to retaining talent, they had to shift. He said they were prepared to telework but had to have processes and structures in place to continue to meet the demands of the public.*


Vice Chair Altman thanked him. She asked if the Board updates went to staff, and if they were, it could increase awareness. She said she continued to be worried about the social workers and wanted them to have a finer lens on how they were coping. She said she hoped they would think about that.


**25-0531                      COMMISSIONER REPORTS**

Commissioners shared information of their choosing within the guidelines as established by the Board, which included, but not limited to, past and/or upcoming events.

**ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to come before the Board, Chair Dunlap declared the meeting adjourned at 3:53 p.m.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Arlissa Eason, Deputy Clerk to the Board

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mark Jerrell, Chair