



MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF THE
TOWN OF WALKERTOWN COUNCIL
MARCH 25, 2010

CALL TO ORDER -	Mayor Kenneth "Doc" Davis
INVOCATION BY -	Mayor Doc Davis
PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE -	Council Member Randy Mendenhall

Mayor Doc Davis called the meeting to order at 7:03 p.m. Present were the mayor, Council members Randy Mendenhall, Wayne Hester, Sarah Welch and Peggy Leight. Staff present included: Lynn McKinnie, Scott Snow, Gary Roberts, and Glenn Simmons.

Approval of Agenda as Presented

MOTION: TO APPROVE AGENDA AS PRESENTED
BY: RANDY MENDENHALL
SECOND: PEGGY LEIGHT
VOTE: MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

Approval of Minutes as Presented

- FEBRUARY 25, 2010 – LISTENING TOUR WITH COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
- FEBRUARY 25, 2010 – REGULAR MEETING
- MARCH 11, 2010 – - - - WORKSHOP MEETING

MOTION: TO APPROVE THE FOLLOWING MINUTES:
• FEBRUARY 25, 2010 – LISTENING TOUR WITH COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
• FEBRUARY 25, 2010 – REGULAR MEETING
• MARCH 11, 2010 – - - - WORKSHOP MEETING
BY: WAYNE HESTER
SECOND: RANDY MENDENHALL
VOTE: MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

Before going to the Public Session, Mayor Davis recognized as in attendance: Girl Scout Troop 402-03. They are working towards a special badge – “Model Citizen Badge”.

PUBLIC SESSION

THIS SESSION IS FOR NON-AGENDA ITEMS ONLY AND IS LIMITED TO 3 MINUTES PER SPEAKER. WHEN SPEAKING TO ANY ITEM, PLEASE RESTRICT YOUR REMARKS TO THE SUBJECT AT HAND.

Public Session was opened at 7:05 p.m. with one speaker:

- 1. Chuck Anas
3619 Annie Lane
Walkertown NC 27051

Good evening. I live here in Walkertown – been a resident now for about seven years. It’s been a while since I’ve been to one of the town council meetings and I’m glad to see the changes and improvements going on in Walkertown – the sidewalks, and we just got a new drugstore. We’ve got an O’Reilly’s opening up – and I’m seeing progress. But, my point tonight is I am a little bit concerned as to the appearance that this town puts out to passersby and people traveling through; particularly those on our state highways, being 66 and 311 – which obviously run right through our town. I think we need to do a little bit more in the terms of having the private property owners – not looking to spend any taxpayer or town money or county money – but as you come down 66 heading into town, I mean, ya’ll know the fence that’s falling over, the rental properties with cars parked on the yard, trash, cinder blocks sitting there. You go by an abandoned gas station with debris blownd up against the chain link fence. You got another house with junk cars. I mean, that’s just 66! And I know 311, another state highway running through our town, you got the old Forsyth factory over there and I know there’s plans to do something with it, but, I mean, that’s been there like it’s been sitting, for a long time and I think anything that’s taped off and marked unsafe should be taken care of in a, you know, expeditious manner. And I’m just wondering if there’s any procedures in place that the town can do – and I’m not trying to single out any individual home owner or property owner or renter – but we need to do something to make this town look a little bit more like a town that we’re proud of - instead of like it’s a place that doesn’t have a landfill within a hundred miles of it. Thank you very much.

Public Session was closed at 7:08 p.m.

BUSINESS FOR DISCUSSION AND/OR ACTION:

1. **PUBLIC HEARING**

Advertised: March 11, 2010

ORDINANCE: CHANGE ZONING JURISDICTION FROM FORSYTH COUNTY TO TOWN OF WALKERTOWN FOR RECENTLY ANNEXED DAVIS ROAD

PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED AND CLOSED AT 7:10 P.M. WITH NO SPEAKERS FOR OR AGAINST.

(This is a routine action following the annexation of this property. The zoning for the property itself is not changed – it remains the same – however, the jurisdiction authority will pass from Forsyth County to the Town of Walkertown.)

MOTION: TO CHANGE THE ZONING JURISDICTION FROM FORSYTH COUNTY TO TOWN OF WALKERTOWN FOR PROPERTY RECENTLY ANNEXED AND KNOWN AS: PIN #6848-43-2285 BLOCK #3002 LOT #001C ALBERT DAY – DAVIS ROAD - WA-040

BY: WAYNE HESTER

SECOND: PEGGY LEIGHT

VOTE: MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

2. **PUBLIC HEARING**

Advertised: March 11, 2010

ORDINANCE: WA-UDO-14 PROPOSED BY CITY-COUNTY PLANNING STAFF AMENDING AND CLARIFYING VARIOUS PROVISIONS OF THE UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCES

PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED AT 7:11 P.M.

Gary Roberts, FC/WS Planning Board, spoke to this issue.

MR. ROBERTS: This is a text amendment to the Unified Development Ordinance of Walkertown – and that’s the ordinance that governs land use development in the town and it’s WA-UDO-14. It’s text amendments comprised of three text amendments that have actually already been to Winston-Salem and Forsyth County for adoption over the last year or so. So it’s kind of a “batch” text amendment where we grouped these together and then we’re bringing for ya’ll to consider. You did have a “work session” with the Planning Board a little over a month ago. The Planning Board reviewed this at their meeting on March 10th and they recommended approval – their vote was 4 to 1 – for approval; and Staff recommends approval. So, I’ll just briefly go through the different sections. I won’t read the proposed text changes but I will read the background and where necessary, the Analysis, to talk about a little bit, the reasoning for it and what’s entailed. So I just encourage ya’ll to stop me at any time – feel free to interrupt me and ask questions.

I think, probably on the ordinance hand-out that you have, it should be on Page - 2-, the top of the section, it says “Section 1 Request” and I’ll just read the background there – and this is related UDO-187, which was adopted by Winston-Salem and Forsyth county in May and June of 2008.

SECTION 1 REQUEST:

“The GB District is a high-intensity commercial district which is generally found along the older urban commercial corridors of Winston-Salem. This district currently requires a minimum twenty foot front setback, (that’s for new buildings) which limits redevelopment opportunities for properties with this type of zoning. Removing this front setback requirement would allow greater flexibility in redeveloping GB zoned property and would promote more pedestrian and transit-friendly commercial infill development in accordance with Legacy principles.”

And, to my knowledge, Walkertown does not have any GB zoning. Winston-Salem has a lot of GB zoning – it’s in their older, commercial areas. It allows for residential use, similar to PB (Pedestrian Business) but it’s mostly commercial, retail office and some light manufacturing. So, this text amendment would just allow people to not have to set their building back twenty feet off the right-of-way if they wanted the building up on the right-of-way, they could. I’ll be glad to read the analysis, if necessary.

One other part of it is it did also *allow for up to 35% of their parking requirements to be for on-street parking* – but that’s with the approval of the town manager for city maintained streets and NC-DOT for state maintained streets. And, that’s comparable for what you already allow for LB and PB.

Are there any questions about Section 1? Again, Staff's recommendation is for approval and Winston-Salem/Forsyth County has already adopted that and your Planning Board recommend approval for that.

MAYOR: Any questions for Gary? I think we hashed it out pretty good but now is the time – we've even got Glenn (Simmons) as a back-up here tonight. Thank ya'll for being here.

MR. ROBERTS: All right, Page -6-, Section 2.

SECTION 2 REQUEST

This UDO text amendment is proposed by City-County Planning Board staff to allow greater flexibility in the platting requirements for commercial, industrial, multifamily residential, and institutional uses that are part of a master-planned site. Section 2 corresponds to UDO-193 which was adopted by Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Planning Board in December, 2008.

As development projects have become increasingly complex in recent years, the need to separate them into separate pieces/phases for the purpose of financing has increased. This need to phase a project may require the developer to subdivide the overall project into separate lots to secure financing from one or more lenders and, to further satisfy lending requirements, may require that each lot be separately owned. Currently, the UDO requires that staff only approve subdivision plats that meet all ordinance requirements. (In other words, all the sections of the street – water and sewer lines have to be in place.) On a large commercial or multifamily site, it may be difficult to subdivide the overall project into parcels that meet all requirements of the UDO.

Given the evolving nature of development financing, staff understands the need to allow greater flexibility in securing financing for large commercial or multifamily projects. Staff proposes language be added to Chapter D (Subdivision Ordinance) that would allow greater flexibility in the platting requirements of large development projects. The language proposed would allow staff to approve a plat for a piece/phase of the overall development, which may not by itself, meet all minimum requirements of the UDO. The overall project would still meet minimum UDO requirements and approval of the plat would tie its compliance to the overall site. (There would be a note on the plat.)

Hopefully, we will have some more subdivision plats. Are there any questions about this Section 2?

All right. Section 3, page -8-.

SECTION 3 REQUEST

This relates to UDO-194 which was adopted by Winston-Salem and Forsyth County in January and February 2009. (regarding parking standards for vehicles and bicycle parking.)

In response to the recently adopted Phase II Stormwater Requirements, the Winston-Salem City Council asked Planning Staff to consider the feasibility of reducing minimum parking requirements for various land uses as a means of encouraging reduced

impervious surface coverage. Staff reviewed information on parking standards from the American Planning Association and other sources, and determined some land uses had existing UDO parking requirements which were higher when compared with municipalities across the Country. Staff also observed that many existing sites classified as these land uses were required to include more parking than was necessary. Staff recommends reducing parking requirements for these uses, which are primarily retail and office uses, by approximately 15%.

And what this text amendment also does, it allows people – right now, you can get credit up to 2% of your parking requirements for bicycle parking – and this allows you to go up to 5% - so if you had to put in 100 spaces, you could only put in 98, 2% reduction if you put in some bicycle parking. This will allow you to knock 5 parking spaces off that if you put bicycle parking. And this was recommended approval, again, by the Planning Staff and your Planning Board. Just to give you an example, right now in your ordinance for, let's say the use of "Arts and Craft Studio" – you have to put in one (1) parking space for every 400 square feet of the building area and this would decrease that by about 15% so you would only have to put in one parking space per 450 square feet of building area.

MAYOR: But no bike spaces are actually required, right? Is that correct?

MR. ROBERTS: No, sir. Yes, that is correct. It's an option.

MAYOR: So, our newest drugstore, for instance, that has several bike spaces - - - that was all voluntary, is that correct?

MR. ROBERTS: That is correct. Now, if they do put those in, they can receive credit and reduce the number of vehicle spaces but it's not a mandatory thing. So that's just kind of an example – I'll give you one other example. Let's say, the use of a bank – that's one of our highest traffic generators. They are required to put in one parking space for every 200 square feet of building area. This would allow them to only have to put in one parking space per 225 – so, again, it's just about a 15% decrease. Any questions about this Section 3?

MS. LEIGHT: Is there a way to differentiate when a building is going to be inside a shopping center that has other parking lots around it versus a stand-alone?

MR. ROBERTS: Well.....the parking rate for a shopping center can include multiple tenants and I think that was reduced in here also – from one to 200 to one to 225.

MS. LEIGHT: Because I was just thinking of – again, the one I keep bringing up is the Family Pharmacy, which was required to have 11 spaces in the "old" – in the way the UDO currently stands. With the "new" UDO – with this change, it could drop actually to nine (9) with the bicycle rack....ten (10) and then nine (9) if they put in a bicycle rack.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay.

MS. LEIGHT:But....I mean....When you compare that, like, if they were in a shopping center, that wouldn't matter because there's plenty of parking all around it and that wouldn't matter - - - but, as a stand-alone, that's not very much.

MR. ROBERTS: Not very many spaces???

MS. LEIGHT: It's not very many spaces for a building. So I was just wondering if there is a way to differentiate when you're saying, "*this many*

spaces” when – then literally, that’s all you’ve got versus O’Reilly’s, which is going to be in the middle of a shopping center which has spaces all around.

MR. ROBERTS:You have opportunity for shared parking – yeah – no. I mean, all these – obviously it can be, except for the use of shopping center, it can be individual stand alone uses and I think, obviously, with as example, the Seafood Shack – you’ve got the situation where they have on their site, the required number – but they’re exceeding that on the gravel lot adjacent to that because there’s just a very popular establishment. The ordinance doesn’t have any maximum caps but it does allow people to exceed if they want to, but I guess it’s a possibility that you could get into a scenario where the lot does not have enough parking. That’s a possibility. I really don’t know, other than just - - - you know, if that was a concern for that use and a food or drug store that would be used for pharmacy.....

MS. LEIGHT:It could have been anything there – it just happened to be the pharmacy - - that’s all right.

MR. ROBERTS: Yeah.

MAYOR: Other questions for Gary? All right.

MR. ROBERTS: Okay. The last section – is the largest. It’s made up of seven or eight different subsections. This is Section -4- and it starts on Page -21-. And this is related to UDO 195, which was adopted by Winston-Salem Forsyth County in February and April of last year, 2009. And it’s non-substantive changes, basically. These are a lot less substantive, if you will – some of them are just clarity definitions type – some of them are a little bit more important, but they were all grouped together at this time as well because of their degree of impact on the ordinance, I guess.

SECTION 4 REQUEST

Since the adoption of the UDO, several clean-up text amendments have been presented to the Planning Board. These amendments address conflicts or practical difficulties discovered by City-County staff through daily use of the ordinance. The changes in this text amendment were collected between February 2008 and December 2008 with the intent of being presented as one unified text amendment. These modifications do not substantively change the ordinance, but improve its clarity and remove conflicting or outdated regulatory language.

MR. ROBERTS: So, I’ll just briefly go through these subsections and, again, feel free to stop me at any time if you have any questions.

Subsection 1. Subsection 1 makes minor changes to the definitions section of the ordinance, including creating a definition for cross-parcel access easements.

Subsection 2 and 3. These subsections remove the site plan submission requirement for the NSB (that’s Neighborhood Shopping Center Business) and C (Campus District) Zoning Districts. The current site plan submission requirement for these districts is vague and does not specify when a site plan must be submitted or who is responsible for reviewing the site plan. Inspections staff have considered site plans which are required to obtain a building permit as satisfying this requirement, and as such staff recommends removing this unnecessary ordinance language.

Subsection 4. Subsection 4 amends table B.3.4 to reference the correct minimum setback requirements for the GB Zoning District. (And this is actually related to the previous text amendment! We found out that when we did that, Subsection 1, we were talking about the setback for GB, we didn't address the table. There's always these cross-sections that you've got to address in the ordinance and this just cleans that up and addresses that table. That was UDO 187) Minimum setback requirements for the GB District are proposed for elimination as per Section 1 of this subject text amendment, WA-UDO 14 (UDO-187). However, UDO-187 inadvertently left out the needed change to this table.

Subsection 5. Subsection 5 amends the section of the ordinance regulating combined driveway and access by requiring that any cross access easements between properties must be formally recorded.

Subsection 6. This Subsection modifies the buffer yard standards of the ordinance. These changes clarify that the buffer yard requirements of the ordinance apply to the construction of a new structure, and allow the Director of Inspections to approve buffer yards in locations other than the outer perimeter of a lot, where the intent of the buffer yard section is still met. (So, if you've got a small business, but you've got a large 5-acre lot, instead of having to put the buffer yard around the whole entire lot, the Director of Inspections can allow a more reasonable practical installation of the buffer yard – just to contain where the actual activity is.)

Subsection 7. This subsection adds the correct cross-references for the amortization of signs to the Nonconforming Uses section of the ordinance.

Subsection 8. Subsection 8 eliminates the requirement for Special Use District Zoning petitions containing two or more zoning districts to be considered as two separate zoning petitions. Currently, General Use Zoning petitions requesting two or more zoning districts may be considered as one zoning petition. Staff believes the existing Special Use District requirement is unnecessarily burdensome and should be removed.

Staff recommends approval, as did your Planning Board, and that is the last portion of it. I'll be glad to answer any questions.

PUBLIC HEARING was closed at 7:26 p.m.

MAYOR: Any additional questions for Gary? Any clarification needed? You've heard the recommendation.....is there a motion?

MOTION: TO APPROVE ORDINANCE: WA-UDO-14 PROPOSED BY CITY-COUNTY PLANNING STAFF AMENDING AND CLARIFYING VARIOUS PROVISIONS OF THE UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCES

BY: RANDY MENDENHALL

SECOND: WAYNE HESTER

VOTE: MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

**3. RESOLUTION:
TO APPROVE AGREEMENT WITH WINSTON-SALEM FORSYTH
COUNTY HOUSING CONSORTIUM FOR PERIOD OF 2011-2013**

DISCUSSION:

MAYOR: The cost for this is \$2,000 per year so this is approving for 2011, 2012, and 2013, if the Council wants to do this. Is there an opinion on this, Council?

**MOTION: TO CONTINUE WITH THE FORSYTH COUNTY HOUSING
CONSORTIUM AGREEMENT FOR THE PERIOD OF 2011,
2012, AND 2013**

BY: SARAH WELCH

SECOND: RANDY MENDENHALL

VOTE: MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

MAYOR: This is what we pay - \$2,000 each year – to be a member, whether we help anyone or not. Ms. Welch has been our committee member on this.

**4. RESOLUTION:
TO CONSIDER AGREEMENT BETWEEN ASCAP AND TOWN OF
WALKERTOWN (AMERICAN SOCIETY OF COMPOSERS, AUTHORS & PUBLISHERS)**

DISCUSSION:

MAYOR: You've seen all the responses where the Clerk has polled the various towns – some did, some didn't, some did several years ago and haven't heard from them since so..... What's your feelings? Is there a motion to consider their agreement?

MR. MENDENHALL: I make a motion to approve.....

**MOTION: TO APPROVE AGREEMENT WITH ASCAP
(AMERICAN SOCIETY OF COMPOSERS, AUTHORS & PUBLISHERS)**

BY: RANDY MENDENHALL

SECOND: SARAH WELCH

VOTE: MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

MS. LEIGHT:After we just had that Ethics Class!!

MR. HESTER:It's not one of my favorite things, but I think we have to go along with it because of the laws, so....

MR. MENDENHALL:My thoughts, exactly, Wayne.....

MS. LEIGHT: To explain.....ASCAP is the recording association of recording artists and because Walkertown has a 4th of July celebration and plans to have a Fall Festival where bands will come in – they are requiring us to pay an annual fee because they play music at our events.

MR. HESTER: This is copyrighted music that writers and so forth have got the copyrights to for us and if we use – or anyone else uses – has to be paid.

MS. LEIGHT: Whether it's recorded music or live music. Every municipality, every commercial – restaurants – anything.....commercial use. Has to pay it!

5. **RESOLUTION:**
**DIRECTING TOWN CLERK TO INVESTIGATE VOLUNTARY
ANNEXATION PETITION FOR:**
JUDY E. CALLAN - 4975 OLD BELEWS CREEK ROAD

DISCUSSION:

None

**MOTION: TO DIRECT TOWN CLERK TO INVESTIGATE
VOLUNTARY ANNEXATION PETITION FOR:
JUDY E. CALLAN - 4975 OLD BELEWS CREEK ROAD**
BY: WAYNE HESTER
SECOND: PEGGY LEIGHT
VOTE: MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

6. **DISCUSSION - - - - - JULY 4TH HOT DOG DAY**

DISCUSSION:

MAYOR: If you'll look in your packet, proposing to move July 4th celebration to the 3rd instead of the 4th. The 4th of course will still come on the 4th, but we're going to move our celebration to the 3rd! We're not changing the calendar! The 4th falls on Sunday this year so we were looking to change it to the 3rd and in addition to that, you can vote on it separately or together – we've been offered to have it at the Wickenham Park, as opposed to behind Town Hall. That means we would not be able to rent the port-a-johns!!!! – as we have in the past – And we'd have a much better place, much more convenient. They've already rescheduled their day on the 3rd so we can have full access of the park on the 3rd! Do you want to vote on this together or???

MR. HESTER: I say we put them together and vote on both of them at the same time.

MAYOR: Okay. What's your pleasure on moving our hot dog – 4th of July – celebration to the 3rd, which is open to the public – all the town's people for hot dogs and music – if we have music, I assume we will – and have it at Wickenham Park?

**MOTION: TO PUT THE TWO TOGETHER.....MOVE JULY 4TH HOT
DOG DAY TO JULY 3RD AND MOVE IT FROM TOWN
HALL TO THE WICKENHAM PARK**
BY: WAYNE HESTER
SECOND: RANDY MENDENHALL
VOTE: MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

7. **FINANCIAL STATEMENTS**

✓ FEBRUARY, 2010

DISCUSSION:

MR. HESTER: Everything is basically like it was the last time; mainly, and I make a motion that we accept the financial report as is.

MOTION: TO ACCEPT FEBRUARY, 2010, FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AS PRESENTED
BY: WAYNE HESTER
SECOND: PEGGY LEIGHT
VOTE: MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

8. COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTPeggy Leight
REVIEW AND UPDATE FROM MARCH MEETING

MS. LEIGHT: Just a quick update – they’ve put out the new fee schedule and municipalities of our size, the fee has actually stayed the same - \$877.00 for the year to be a member of the Council of Government. They are looking into a number of grants – state energy grants, green energy grants, a way for municipalities to cut energy costs and helping municipalities go through the reviews and get money possibly from the grants to do those things – reduce costs. That’ll be coming up in the next few months. And one of the things they are considering is merging the Northwest Piedmont Council of Government with the Piedmont Triad Council of Government, which is High Point, Greensboro, Burlington – that area, which will make it one very large Council of Governments. But they are still in the negotiating process for that.

MAYOR: Would this change the fee schedule then?

MS. LEIGHT: No. That’s one of the things they have to negotiate because their fee schedule is different – and their voting is different. That’s one of the major points is that right now, in our Council of Government, it’s one municipality – one vote – no matter how big or small you are. On their Council of Government, it’s weighted. So, of course, Greensboro and High Point would get more votes than the others. They said that’s one point where absolutely it would have to be one municipality, one vote, because there’s so many rural areas – at least in our Council of Government.

MAYOR: This is a very broad – they cover a lot of ground, the Council of Government does. We do want to stay in tune with that.

9. SET WORKSHOP MEETING DATE FOR WEDNESDAY, APRIL 7TH
2010 AT 6:00 P.M. AT TOWN HALL

MAYOR: Any other business? You see the other update minutes in your packet.

✓ **MONTHLY MISCELLANEOUS AND COMMITTEE UPDATES**

NOTE: IF NO MEETING – NO COMMITTEE UPDATES

1. PLANNING BOARD MINUTES – MARCH 10, 2010
2. FALL FESTIVAL MINUTES OF MARCH 8, 2010

PUBLIC SESSION

THIS SESSION IS FOR ANY TOPIC AND IS LIMITED TO 3 MINUTES PER SPEAKER
WHEN SPEAKING TO ANY ITEM, PLEASE RESTRICT YOUR REMARKS TO THE SUBJECT AT HAND.

Public Session was opened and closed at 7:39 p.m. with no speakers.

ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION: TO ADJOURN MEETING AT 7:40 P.M.
BY: WAYNE HESTER
SECOND: RANDY MENDENHALL
VOTE: MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY

ANNOUNCEMENTS

RECYCLING – every other week – Monday

APRIL
ROUTE A – 5TH AND 19TH
ROUTE B – 12TH AND 26TH

TOWN HALL IS ROUTE B*

TOWN COUNCIL MEETINGS:

Fourth Thursday @ 7:00 p.m.
APRIL 22
MAY 27
JUNE 24
JULY 22
AUGUST 26
SEPTEMBER 23
OCTOBER 28
NOVEMBER 18 DUE TO THANKSGIVING
DECEMBER 23 COULD BE CHANGED??

PLANNING BOARD MEETINGS:

Walkertown Library @ 3:00 on 1st Tuesday - - - -

PLEASE NOTE: HOSPICE & PALLIATIVE CARECENTER IS CONDUCTING A PRESENTATION ON LIVING WILL AND HEALTH CARE POWER OF ATTORNEY AND YOU WILL RECEIVE A FREE COPY OF EACH. THIS WILL TAKE PLACE ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 14, 2010 AT 11:00 A.M. AT THE WALKERTOWN LIBRARY. HOSPICE WILL GO OVER THE DOCUMENTS. THERE IS NO CHARGE FOR THIS PROGRAM BUT TO RESERVE A SPACE, CALL 768-6157- XT 1622.