

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE
CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SANFORD
SANFORD, NORTH CAROLINA

The City Council met at the Sanford Municipal Center, 225 E. Weatherspoon Street, on Tuesday, May 18, 2004, at 7:00 P.M. The following people were present:

Mayor Winston C. Hester	Council Member Linwood S. Mann, Sr.
Mayor Pro Tem Joseph E. Martin	Council Member James G. Williams
Council Member Clawson Ellis	Council Member Walter H. McNeil, Jr.
Council Member Cornelia P. Olive	Council Member Philip E. Dusenbury
City Manager Leonard Barefoot	City Attorney Susan C. Patterson
City Clerk Bonnie D. White	

Mayor Hester called the meeting to order. Council Member Clawson Ellis delivered the invocation.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mayor Hester explained agenda changes. Council has received a handout replacing Page 14 of the packet for 2003 CDBG Urban Redevelopment Grant, which has a correction in wording for Section 5 changing Financial Services Director to Community Development Director. On the Regular Agenda, an item is to be added as 6-I, Award of Proposal for Engineering Services on Little Buffalo Creek Project.

Upon motion of Council Member James Williams and seconded by Council Member Walter McNeil, the amended agenda was unanimously approved.

CONSENT AGENDA

Approval of May 4, 2004 City Council Minutes—Filed in Minute Book 61

The consent agenda item was approved upon motion of Mayor Pro Tem Joseph Martin; seconded by Council Member Cornelia Olive, the motion carried unanimously.

CASES FOR PUBLIC HEARING

Public Hearing on the Adoption of the Crossroads of Depot Park Urban Redevelopment Plan

Downtown Sanford Executive Director David Montgomery reported that in a special meeting on May 6, the City of Sanford Planning Board certified its recommendation of approval for the Crossroads at Depot Park Urban Redevelopment Plan to the City of Sanford City Council. The plan describes activities to be undertaken by the Sanford Downtown Redevelopment Commission for blocks generally between Moore Street, Wicker Street, McIver Street, First Street, Weatherspoon Street, Seaboard Railway, and Charlotte Avenue. The Urban Redevelopment Plan is a public policy instrument authorized by the State of North Carolina which helps direct federal and local funds into a particular distressed area. A redevelopment plan indicates its relationship to definitive local objectives as to appropriate land uses, improved traffic, public

transportation, public utilities, and recreational and community facilities. The State of North Carolina recognizes the importance of protecting and promoting the health, safety, and welfare of the inhabitants of its urban areas by authorizing redevelopment commissions to undertake public and private initiatives of rehabilitation, conservation, and reconditioning of areas where in the absence of such action, there is a clear and present danger that the area will become blighted.

The main goal of this urban redevelopment plan is to remove urban blight and to provide economic opportunities through private/public partnerships supportive of the major public investment which is currently taking place at Depot Park. Proposed activities include the renovation of Depot Park; the restoration of the Sanford Buggy Company into a multi-use economic engine; a new roof at the Montessori School; façade improvements on 121 Chatham Street; streetscape along Chatham Street between Charlotte Avenue and McIver Street and Charlotte Avenue between Hawkins Avenue and Little Buffalo Creek; the demolition of King Roofing Facility; the conversion of Chatham Street from two-way to one-way with diagonal parking; the acquisition and clearance of property located along Little Buffalo Creek for a buffer and eventual greenway; rezoning of property located in the redevelopment area from General Business (GB) District to Central Business (CB) District and from Industrial to Office and Institutional (O&I) District; and allow upper floor housing in the Central Business District with less than five units, as the ordinance currently allows.

The controls and restrictions provided by the redevelopment plan shall be in force and in effect for twenty years from the date of approval of the plan. The plan may be modified, changed, or amended at any time by the City of Sanford with the approval of the local governing body and the planning commission.

The City Council, at this time, has the opportunity either to approve, amend, or reject the redevelopment plan as submitted.

Mr. Montgomery explained that Weatherspoon Street acts like a boundary for the Urban Redevelopment Plan. Community Development is currently trying to find funds to acquire and remove the burned out facility owned by Bucky Williams. Community Development Director Bob Bridwell stated that no source of funding has yet been found for acquisition of the property, and Council would hear from staff again before approving this.

Council Member James Williams asked if Mr. Montgomery had found a way to include King Roofing even though it is occupied. Mr. Montgomery replied that this is only a proposed plan. We do not have funding to acquire King Roofing. We are currently looking at Brownfield funding and other sources of funds to try to acquire that. Mayor Hester emphasized that this is the proposed plan. There will be negotiations and they will come back to us later. Mr. Montgomery agreed that the Mayor was correct.

Council Member Phil Dusenbury remarked that Depot Park is the cornerstone of all of this and that *The Sanford Herald* really jumped on the Park for last Thursday night.

Council Member Clawson Ellis replied that they needed to. He said he counted 23 people that day. Mayor Hester mentioned that it was reported in the *Herald* that the problem with attendance was that they couldn't find a place to park. He explained that the article said that the place looks too torn up to be able to have an event. Mr. Ellis said there was plenty of parking on the other end. Mr. Montgomery mentioned that the Lee County Community Orchestra was there Sunday with a 35-piece orchestra, 150 in attendance, and that City Park Antique Mall and Java Express were open and somehow they found enough parking. He said if anyone had problems with parking to call him.

Mayor Hester opened the public hearing. No one spoke in favor or in opposition. The hearing was closed.

Mayor Pro Tem Joseph Martin, whose wife is employed by Progressive Development Corp., requested to be recused from voting. Upon motion by Council Member Cornelia Olive and seconded by Council Member Linwood Mann, the motion passed 6-0.

Consider Adoption of Resolution by Sanford City Council Supporting and Adopting the Crossroads of Depot Park Urban Redevelopment Plan—(Exhibit A)

Council Member Phil Dusenbury made the motion to approve the resolution and it was seconded by Council Member Linwood Mann. The motion carried 6-0.

REGULAR AGENDA

Consider Capital Project Budget Ordinance Amendment-Water Capital Improvements—(Exhibit B)

Budget Director Barbara Cox explained that this ordinance would finalize the \$7 million project that we negotiated with BB&T and obtained financing terms for 15 years at 3.67 percent interest. The amount requested in appropriations tonight is \$6,550,000 for capital improvements for the water treatment plant and renovations of the raw water pump station, including providing a higher level of treatment for discharge of wastewater from the treatment process and various repairs/replacements at the plant. We have previously adopted a \$450,000 amendment, which brings the total to \$7 million.

Upon motion of Council Member Walter McNeil and seconded by Council Member James Williams, the motion passed unanimously.

Consider Capital Project Budget Amendment Water and Sewer Improvements Projects – (Exhibit C)

Budget Director Barbara Cox explained that this ordinance would amend our original Ordinance No. 2002-6. This would provide an appropriation of interest funds received over the course of the project in the amount of \$23,667. Those funds in the Sewer Capital area will be used for sewer rehab. Also, in this project, we would like to transfer \$412,810 established in Water Capital to Sewer Capital for sewer rehabilitation. This would close out this prior project.

Upon motion of Council Member Clawson Ellis and seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Joseph Martin, the motion passed unanimously.

Consider 2003 CDBG Urban Redevelopment Grant CDBG Project Ordinance – (Exhibit D)

Mayor Hester reminded Council of the change in wording for Section 5 from “Financial Services Director” to Community Development Director.

Budget Director Barbara Cox explained that this ordinance provides the budgetary funding for the CDBG grant in the amount of \$900,000 for projects listed in the ordinance.

City Manager Leonard Barefoot questioned the last sentence of Section 1: “Finally, funds will be used for the demolition of the King Roofing Building.” Ms. Cox said this was contingent upon our purchasing the building. Mr. Montgomery explained that the application was written thinking that we would use Clean Water Management Trust Fund monies to purchase that building and that has not been the case, so we are looking for funds. Mr. Barefoot said he wanted to be certain that that answers Council Member James Williams’s earlier question regarding King Roofing building.

Council Member Clawson Ellis questioned passing the ordinance with the King Roofing wording included. Mr. Bridwell explained that Clean Water originally approved that project; however they are not going to fund the acquisition of buildings, only land.

Mayor Hester asked City Attorney Susan Patterson how we stood legally on this. Attorney Patterson replied that it came down to whether the funds in the CBDG grant can be used for demolition, which is different from acquisition. Attorney Patterson clarified with Mr. Bridwell that if it is fine to use the funds set aside for demolition, then it would be all right for Council to approve the ordinance in its present fashion. Mr. Ellis reiterated that he did not want to vote for something when he was not sure what he was voting for.

Budget Director Barbara Cox further explained that if they are not allowed to do the demolition, we will have to come back to council upon the grant approval to spend the funds for other purposes. Right now, the purpose the grant was awarded specifies that we would do \$33,00 in demolition. Mr. Ellis said he could live with that. Planner II Karen Kennedy advised that the project ordinance is just the front-end part of the grant where you agree to set up the funds. If we change a line item, we would have a public hearing and a resolution to amend the project. What you’re approving is the original intent of the application.

Mayor Pro Tem Joseph Martin requested to be recused from voting due to his wife’s being employed by Progressive Development. Council Member Walter McNeil made the motion to recuse Mr. Martin. Seconded by Council Member Clawson Ellis, the motion carried 6-0.

Council Member James Williams made the motion to approve the project ordinance. Seconded by Council Member Phil Dusenbury, the motion carried 6-0.

Consider Resolution Authorizing the Advertisement of a Public Auction to Sell Certain Personal Property of the City of Sanford—(Exhibit E)

Fleet Maintenance Superintendent Randy Paschal explained that some county property would also be sold. The auction date is June 5, 2004, but the auctioneer has not been selected. Council Member Clawson Ellis requested to be advised which auctioneer was chosen. Mr. Paschal agreed to give Council the information. Council Member Clawson Ellis asked if it were customary to sell county property. Mr. Paschal replied that we have been doing that for several years. Council Member James Williams asked if the equipment were available for inspection. Mr. Paschal replied that it was.

Council Member James Williams made the motion to approve the resolution authorizing the advertisement of a public auction to sell certain personal property of the City of Sanford. Seconded by Council Member Walter McNeil, the motion carried unanimously.

Consider Resolution Authorizing the City Council to Enter into a Ten-Year Lease with Star of Hope Free Will Baptist Church—(Exhibit F)

City Attorney Susan Patterson reminded Council that several meetings ago, Star of Hope Free Will Baptist Church requested a renewal of their ten-year lease for a parking lot that adjoins their property. They have had it for ten years and are requesting Council to consider renewing the lease. The City Clerk has published the notice in the *Herald* for the prescribed times. This is a resolution declaring the property surplus and authorizing the City to enter into the attached ten-year lease, whereby they agree to maintain the property. Mayor Hester confirmed with Attorney Patterson that we have had no known problems in the last ten years.

Council Member Clawson Ellis made a motion to renew the lease. Seconded by Council Member Cornelia Olive, the motion passed unanimously.

Consider Audit Services Contract –(Exhibit G)

Finance Director Melissa Cardinali explained that Council had before them Dixon-Hughes's (formerly Dixon-Odom) proposed fee for the audit services contract for the 2003-2004 year. The fee is proposed to be \$30,800, which is a 2.23 percent increase from the prior year. Council Member Ellis asked if the costs and increase percentage were in line. Finance Director Cardinali responded that they appeared to be competitive and in line. Council Member Williams noted that the per hour cost seemed to have decreased. Mrs. Cardinali explained that the per hour cost is based on which staff level we would have to engage. Typically, we don't have to use the per hour charge. Our audit has always been within the contracted price. Mayor Pro Tem Martin commended Mrs. Cardinali, Budget Director Barbara Cox, and staff for their work.

Mayor Pro Tem Joseph Martin made the motion to approve the contract. Seconded by Council Member Phil Dusenbury, the motion carried unanimously.

Consider Proposal for Lockbox Service and Outsource Bill Printing –(Exhibit H)

Financial Services Director Melissa Cardinali presented a proposal for the City of Sanford to implement Lockbox Service and Outsourcing of utility bill printing and distribution. A manual in Council packet outlines the presentation. Mrs. Cardinali believes the services will have two important results for the citizens: the first being an annual savings of \$68,000 in the Utility Fund, and the second being greater efficiency in our revenue division. The proposal consists of three parts. The first part is to implement Lockbox Service for utility payments made by mail. The second is to implement the Outsourcing of the printing and mailing of utility bills, and the third is to eliminate second notices to utility customers.

Mrs. Cardinali gave a brief overview of our current billing structure: The city mails a post card-style utility bill on the 1st of the month. The payment for that bill is due on the 10th of the month. On the 11th of the month, we send out second notices for any accounts which remain unpaid. Any accounts which are still unpaid on the 20th are disconnected until that account is paid in full.

The first item being proposed is Lockbox Service. Lockbox Service allows customer utility payments made by mail to be sent to a bank's processing center for deposit into the City's bank account. This means the payment is mailed to the bank and not the City. This is simply an extension of services provided under our existing banking services contract which we have with RBC Centura. The customer mails the payment to the bank; the bank then deposits the payment into the City's bank account and forwards the payment information on to the City; the City then credit the customer's account reflecting payment, and this process happens on a daily basis so that accounts are kept up to date. Mayor Hester asked if this affected the automatic draft accounts. Mrs. Cardinali replied that it did not. Council Member Clawson Ellis asked what the bank charged for handling this. Mrs. Cardinali advised that it would be covered under "requirements" coming up in the presentation.

Mrs. Cardinali explained the benefits. One of the major benefits is costs savings. This will reduce personnel costs. At a minimum, one budgeted position would be eliminated. This reduction, coupled with the use of part-time staff, results in an estimated savings of \$68,600 in the first year. These savings will help the City keep utility rate increases to a minimum. A one (1%) percent rate increase in water and sewer across the board is approximately \$86,000. Council Member Cornelia Olive inquired when was the last rate increase and how much it was. Mrs. Cardinali responded this past year in the amount of 7 percent. Mr. Ellis asked if the \$68,000 could be broken down, and said he felt this should have been presented in a work session, not in a meeting. Mrs. Cardinali said they looked at the positions and the savings that would result from eliminating a budgeted position and using part time people on a continual basis, instead of replacing a person who is retiring at the present time. That would save us approximately \$92,000, and then with the cost of implementation, that brings us to the \$68,000. That \$68,000 represents our total savings plus our total costs to implement the service or the net savings. Mrs. Cardinali explained that we would be using part time people and the savings on that second position is in fringe benefits. The one position being eliminated

was budgeted, but never filled. Mr. Ellis requested a breakdown in the difference in the person retiring and part time employees.

Mrs. Cardinali also expects increased efficiency in the Revenue Department. This department manually handles over 66,000 pieces of mail every year. This change would allow the department to focus on customer service. Ms. Olive asked if this were all water bills and how many staff members are working on this now. Mrs. Cardinali replied that the figure represents all water bills and we have six staff members. The proposal is for the billing information to be forwarded to the bank via the computer. Mrs. Cardinali reiterated that the customer sends the payment to the bank. We would receive it back electronically every single day and post it to the customer's account immediately. Mr. Ellis asked how the meter reader's readings would get to the bank. Mrs. Cardinali explained that the City would generate the statement. Another company will print the bill and mail it. Ms. Olive asked if they had checked to see how often the computers were down at RBC. Ms. Cardinali said she had not specifically asked that question, but would be glad to do that. It is a processing center and this is all they do—process payments for customers. Mr. Dusenbury asked for clarification on where the processing center would send the statements.

Mrs. Cardinali stated that the second element of the proposal is Outsourcing—the printing and distribution of the utility bills. That means that an outside vendor would print and mail the bills. The City continues to create the bill. The meter readers and billing staff do not change. We create and review and finalize the bills in house. We then send those bills to an outside company via email and that vendor will print and mail the bills to customers. The customer receives the bill and either makes the payment in-house or mails it in. One thing that would change is we would quit using the post card bill and go to an 8½" x 11" letter size bill. It would then go in a return envelope to the bank. Ms. Olive asked how much the vendor would cost. Mrs. Cardinali explained we would no longer pay for paper, postage, or equipment maintenance because the price is an all-encompassing price, but it is difficult to compare on a service-by-service basis because we currently do a post card bill (which customers sometimes say gets lost in their magazines and other mail.) The annual cost is \$80,000 without second notices.

In response to a question by Mr. Ellis, Revenue Officer Billy Douglas informed Council that it cost the City about \$20,000 this past year to send second notices. Mayor Pro Tem Joseph Martin asked what the effect would be if second notices were not mailed. Mrs. Cardinali explained that they called sixteen cities and water authorities and found no one who sends a second notice. Due to the very long lines on the dates due, she did not believe that sending a second notice seemed to encourage payment of the bill. She explained that the first time a customer's name is on the cut-off list in a twelve-month period, City forgives the late charge of \$20. We send a letter to the customer informing them it was forgiven, and remind customer of due dates.

Council Member Williams remarked that although this is new to the Council, it seems to be the way it is being done in the business world. His insurance company has been doing it a long time and he believes it is time for the City to start doing the same

thing. Ms. Olive asked Mr. Williams if he thought the businesses decided it in twenty minutes. He replied no. Mr. Dusenbury said that corporations had been doing this 20-30 years. Mr. Williams said maybe the Council needed more time to understand it because we do represent the citizens.

Mrs. Cardinali explained that the Lockbox would require some additional programming, but we are ready on the utility billing. Our software is able to handle Lockbox service because so many units do implement the Lockbox service. Additional programming would be required for compatibility with the bank's software. The bank has offered to split that programming cost with us 50/50. They have estimated the total cost would be \$15,000-\$20,000 with the cost to Sanford being \$7,500-\$10,000. Those costs are calculated into that \$68,000 savings. Again, to implement Lockbox, we would have to discard the post card billing. The standard bill format in utility services is the 8½" x 11" letter size bill. Our monthly bank fees would increase by \$300 or \$3,600 per year, but we are able to benefit from our existing relationship with RBC. If we went out and tried to do this without our banking relationship, it could run as much as \$17,000, so we believe the \$3,600 is extremely reasonable for an annual cost.

Mrs. Cardinali said window payments would continue to be handled the same way. Our goal is that by not handling the sixty-some thousand pieces of mail, we will be able to give more attention to the people who call and who come into City Hall. Mayor Pro Tem Joseph Martin asked if customers could go to RBC and pay their bills in cash. Mrs. Cardinali said they would not be able to do that. Council Member Cornelia Olive asked if we had a contract on the \$36,000 per year bank charges. Mrs. Cardinali explained that we bid for banking services every three years. We have a three-year contract with RBC Centura. This adds another piece to the services. The more services that you put together, the better price the bank can give you, saving money. Two to two and a half days of just printing bills would be saved, and that staff person could work on other billing issues. Outsourcing would also help meter readers to focus on their primary jobs rather than delivering mail. The printing company is in Columbia, South Carolina and the Lockbox would be in Rocky Mount or Raleigh. Council Member James Williams asked if this would speed up the new customers time period in getting a bill. Mrs. Cardinali explained that it would not affect that. Additionally, outsourcing will allow us to add an additional insert for about half a cent per bill. If Public Works or Council has a mass mailing that they would like to reach utility bill customers, we would be able to do that in a very efficient and cost effective way which we cannot do at the present time. Mr. Dusenbury asked how long this contract would be for. Mrs. Cardinali said the Lockbox would only be until our banking services contract is up which is February 1, 2005, and the Outsourcing vendor isn't requiring a contract. That Outsourcing vendor is used by several other cities for utility billing and water authorities.

The final part of the proposal is to eliminate second notices, which costs \$10,000 a year in postage alone. No other cities we checked send out a second notice. This is a very important time to consider this service, as Senior Collection Clerk Linda Hall retired today. These services are also in response to rising utility rates and the need to reduce our operating costs. Because of uncertainties with our County contracts, we believe these

services will keep us flexible so that we can respond to any service level changes that may come up with the City in the next six to twelve months.

In summary, we would like to implement the Lockbox and the Outsourcing programs. It will take sixty to ninety days to get it going, so our target implementation date is September 1. We are asking to do that outside the normal budget process because we have had a retirement, and we want to eliminate the full-time budgeted position which has not been filled and continue to try to fill the gap with our part-time employees.

Council Member Linwood Mann asked if the \$10,000 savings on second notices was part of the \$68,000. Mrs. Cardinali said that it was. If you decide to continue to send second notices, it will cost another \$20,000 so your savings would be closer to \$50,000 instead of \$70,000. Mr. Mann said it seemed liked a win-win situation to him. If it doesn't work, all we have to do was back out of it. Mayor Pro Tem Joseph Martin commented that he is proud that the City has been known to privatize to save the taxpayer money. If we can get a better product and save money, it sounds like a good idea. Mr. Mann said that in listening to the Council's questions and Mrs. Cardinali's answers, he could tell that she had thoroughly researched this. He said that \$68,000 would look good in the budget. Council Member Walter McNeil said that since there is some contention, he suggested this be delayed until the budget meeting to give Council Members who have questions more time to look over it. City Manager Leonard Barefoot responded that was certainly possible. He had wanted them to have the information whether they vote on it tonight or at a later date. Mrs. Cardinali informed Council that she would not be present for the next Law and Finance meeting, but would be glad to assemble whatever information Council needed and send to them. Mr. Barefoot advised that it would be on the June 1 agenda. No action was taken.

Consider Information Regarding Charter Communications Cable Services—(Exhibit I)

City Manager Leonard Barefoot informed Council that we have recently been receiving information from our cable consultant regarding some actions being taken by the FCC regarding the claim by Charter Communications to have some authority relinquished or minimized as far as the local governments purview over some of the regulations. He asked City Attorney Patterson to explain to Council what the action from the FCC was.

Attorney Patterson explained that our cable consultant has informed us that the FCC granted the petition of Charter Communication to deregulate 28 franchising authorities because Charter Communication says that there is effective competition in this area from satellite companies. When there is competition, the cable operators have the right to petition for withdrawal of some of the municipal regulatory authority. This ruling affects the municipality's ability to regulate the hourly rate that they charge for installation services or for some cable services. Basically, in the past, we have had no ability to control what rates the cable company sets for expanded service. If you wanted premium channels or HBO, the cable operators set that rate and they went up when they wanted to, with FCC approval. With this ruling, they de-regulated about 90 communities in two weeks throughout North Carolina, New Jersey, New York, Virginia, and

Maryland. This ruling says that Charter does not have to charge uniform rates within certain communities. (Although under our franchise agreement, they still must serve if there are so many houses per mile.) The cable company no longer has to offer basic service with premium channels. Our basic rate, for the past several years, has not been higher than \$10.50, but this change will allow them to go up on this with a thirty day's notice. In the past they had to file with the FCC an accounting to prove how much the charges were. The cable consultant could appeal this decision, but they have tied his hands because they have asked for information that the satellite companies won't give out. The consultant may send in a petition to have a re-certification on our behalf. He also believes that in about two years, they will rewrite the able act because of all the changes that have occurred. The basic effect of this decision is a continuing erosion of local controls.

Mr. Barefoot added that the bottom line is you didn't have a lot of control and now you have less. Council Member James Williams asked about the franchise fees. Attorney Patterson replied that the franchise fees are still in place, and we have the maximum that we can charge by law. Mayor Hester said that he had read in the action audit that in four years when television becomes completely digital, analogue cable service will disappear.

Award of Proposal for Engineering Services for Little Buffalo Creek Project –(Exhibit J)

Community Development Director Bob Bridwell reported that a very significant complication has come up on acquiring the properties on Little Buffalo Creek. The board of the Clean Water Management Trust Fund decided that we could not acquire buildings, only land. This was a very significant issue because we were starting this project in the downtown area. To accommodate and assist us, they allowed us to consider acquiring properties on Big Buffalo Creek and transferring value in the budget. Considering that Lee County and Sanford have several properties on Big Buffalo Creek, they are allowing us to look at those properties in terms of getting the value of those and transferring money to buy the structure on Little Buffalo Creek. To accomplish that, we have to do an environmental study on those properties. In order to do that, we are going to have to engage an engineering firm to do the Environmental Phase I study of properties. We have selected a company that can accomplish those services for \$2,400, which is very cost effective.

Mr. Bridwell stated that although we do not believe there is any conflict of interest under state law, in the interest of full disclosure, this is to advise the Council that there is a member of the City staff who is related to an employee of that company. This employee will not be involved in that project. We wanted to make sure Council was aware of that.

Council Member Phil Dusenbury made the motion to approve the cost of \$2,400 for the environmental study. Seconded by Council Member James Williams, the motion carried unanimously.

ALL EXHIBITS CONTAINED HEREIN ARE HEREBY INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE AND MADE A PART OF THESE MINUTES.

OTHER BUSINESS

Council Member Cornelia Olive reported that several people had contacted her about how bad the traffic is at the intersection of Bragg Street, Horner Boulevard, and Dalrymple Street, where Eckerd and Walgreen are located and that there have begun to be a lot of wrecks there. A person who runs a business there told her they were averaging a wreck a week with people who were trying to get out of Dollar Tree and Eckerd getting into the lane that people use to get off Bragg Street to go to a restaurant there and a couple of other stores. They would like us to have our traffic department take a look at it to see if that can be corrected. They thought it was hurting their business. Mr. Barefoot believes the state is already working on this as it is a state road, but Public Works Director Larry Thomas will check on it.

City Manager Leonard Barefoot reported that the process for the UDO includes a single meeting with the three planning boards and three councils and/or commissioners in attendance. They are looking to have that at the Public Works large meeting room. The Broadway manager said just to pick a day and Lee County Manager Bill Cowan basically said the same thing. We discussed June 29th, which is the 5th Tuesday, so it would not be one of the normal first, third, second, or fourth Tuesday meeting dates. Council was in agreement.

ADJOURNMENT

With no further business to come before the council, the meeting was adjourned on motion of Council Member James Williams; seconded by Council Member Walter McNeil, the motion carried unanimously.

Respectfully submitted,

WINSTON C. HESTER, MAYOR

ATTEST:

JANICE COX, DEPUTY CITY CLERK