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 4, 2010, at 7:00 P.M. The following people were present:

Mayor Cornelia P. Olive
Council Member Sam Gaskins
Council Member Charles Taylor
Council Member L. I. (Poly) Cohen
City Manager Hal Hegwer
Mayor Pro Tem Mike Stone
Council Member James G. Williams
City Clerk Bonnie D. White
City Attorney Susan C. Patterson

Absent:
Council Member Linwood S. Mann, Sr.
Council Member Walter H. McNeil, Jr.

Mayor Cornelia Olive called the meeting to order. Council Member L. I. (Poly) Cohen delivered the invocation.

PUBLIC COMMENT – (Exhibit A)

Keith Clark, residing at 212 Acorn Drive, signed up to speak. Mr. Clark said that he was against the tax increase in Item 5B – Approval of Budget Ordinance Amending the City of Sanford Water and Sewer Utility Rate Schedule for Fiscal Year 2010-2011. He said that as he understood it we had members of the council that signed the no tax pledge. He is surprised to see it on the consent agenda because when you are charging him more for the same thing that is not costing the City right now, it is a tax increase. Mr. Clark added that he hoped everyone that signed it is here to vote against it. Secondly, he said that he did not know if he wanted to speak at our public hearing because he could not find the items on the website. He was surprised to see that we were renewing our annual health insurance with Blue Cross Blue Shield after the County's experience in finding that the costs could be significantly reduced by re-examining the plan. He would like not to hear a lot about what a tight budget is from the City Council until they have approached it with the same diligence that the County has. He said the water and sewer rate increase is a tax increase.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Council Member Sam Gaskins requested to move Item 5D – Approval to Unfreeze a Front Desk Position in the Police Department - from the Consent Agenda to the Regular Agenda. Mayor Pro Tem Mike Stone requested to move Items 5B – Approval of Budget Ordinance Amending the City of Sanford Water and Sewer Utility Rate Schedule for Fiscal Year 2010 – 2011 and Item 5D – Approval to Purchase 911 Consoles and Furniture off Federal Contract from the Consent Agenda to the Regular Agenda.

Council Member Sam Gaskins made the motion to approve the amended agenda. Seconded by Council Member Charles Taylor, the motion carried unanimously.

CONSENT AGENDA

Approval of City Council Retreat Minutes Dated January 21, 2010 – (Filed in Minute Book 73)

Approval of Sanford/Lee County Regional Airport Request to Purchase a Surplus Vehicle (1998 Chevy Venture Van for $3,000) - (Exhibit B)

Approval of Award of Construction Bid for Haven Complex CDBG-R Project – (Exhibit C)

Approval of Resolution Authorizing the Advertisement of an Offer to Purchase a Vacant Lot in the Washington Park Redevelopment Area – (Exhibit D)

Approval of Annual Renewal of Health Insurance with Blue Cross Blue Shield- (Exhibit E)

All of the above items were discussed at the Law and Finance Committee Meeting on Wednesday, April 28, 2010.

Council Member James Williams made the motion to approve the amended Consent Agenda. Seconded by Council Member L. I. (Poly) Cohen, the motion carried unanimously.

CASE FOR PUBLIC HEARING

Public Hearing for FY 10 Housing Development CDBG Project Applications to the Division of Community Assistance – (Exhibit F)

Community Development Manager Karen Kennedy explained that this is the second and final public hearing to submit the Community Development Block Grant application for housing development projects. One is Autumn Oaks Multi-Family Community on Woodland Avenue and the other is Covington Place Senior Community Project. We will be applying for these community development block grant funds through the Division of Community Assistance. The grant application is due May 21. As of today, she does not have an application from the state yet. In Council's last meeting packet, Council had a copy of the commitment letter where Mr. Bridwell discussed with them the loan commitment for Mr. Hegwer to sign and the review by the Housing Finance Agency and the Division of Community Assistance. She is going to have to change some of the verbiage in that letter. The letter stated that we would loan them $220,000 and the remaining funds would be for administration. Nothing is changing structurally; they will still be receiving the funds for infrastructure and there will still be funds allocated for administration but in order for them to get the full points available through the Housing Finance Agency, our letter of commitment has to state that we are loaning them the entire $250,000. For the Autumn Oaks project, that will be infrastructure that will be tied onto the public infrastructure system; that will be what their funds will be used for. Regarding Covington Place, it will be used for public water and sewer infrastructure as well as the sidewalk portion that fronts Woodland Avenue. Funding can be used for water, sewer, street, and sidewalks improvements.

Mayor Olive opened the public hearing. Mayor Olive verified with Mrs. Kennedy that this does not involve any commitment by the City of Sanford for funding. Mrs. Kennedy replied no local match is required. No one spoke in favor.

Council Member Gaskins clarified that the $250,000 comes from the State to the City and we loan it to the developers and it is paid back to the City. Mrs. Kennedy replied yes. We will loan them the $250,000; they know the portion has to come out for admin; so when we get the money we will not send them the admin portion but they are going to give us that back in the long run. Loaning projects like this is something new to the state so they are very appreciative of us taking this route.

Mayor Pro Tem Stone asked is there is a stated interest rate for that money? Mrs. Kennedy replied that the terms were in the last letter; she thought it was 2 percent. Mr. Stone asked how long will it be after the project is completed, before we start receiving payments on this. Mrs. Kennedy replied within 24 months of the grant startup.

Community Development Director Bob Bridwell informed Council that he would be meeting with BB& T next week, along with Downtown Development Manager II David Montgomery, to start setting up a structure to receive the payments so we can have those revolving funds build for future use.

Mayor. Olive clarified that what he is addressing now is about the Chatham Street project. Mr. Bridwell replied yes; it is the public/private partnership we have with Progressive Contractors. We are setting up the structure to pay back the $450,000 on that loan as well. Mayor Olive asked Mr. Bridwell to explain why we have not received any money from them. Mr. Bridwell replied that in the agreement it was based upon their occupancy and that will kick in this next year. Mayor Olive added that it was her understanding that the project does not have to be complete for them to start repaying because the shops along Chatham Street are occupied; it is just the Buggy Factory that is not occupied. Mr. Bridwell stated that it was the Buggy Factory that we lent the money on; not the shops on Chatham Street and the Buggy Factory has been the slower of all the projects but it will start to kick in shortly as that project rams up.

Mayor Pro Tem Stone stated that it should be noted that there are different structures-some may be set on occupancy or some on the length of time. He felt the fairness would be to find out where this Council wants to go so they are consistent on it; it has been over 24 months on the Chatham Street project. It will be real important for Council to know what kind of structure they are looking at because the real benefit comes in the repayment of that loan so we can show our citizens how we put the money to work for them.

Council Member Taylor asked about the selection of BB&T; is this something we put out for a bid process and how did we select BB&T? Mr. Bridwell replied that he did not think we have selected anybody yet; BB& T offered to meet with them to talk about the possibility of the deal. The last time they did one of these things very few banks were interested in doing it. The individuals they are meeting with are part of a Community Reinvestment Act; their income on these kinds of projects is pretty much nothing. They will start negotiations with BB&T. If they decide to go through a process that requires any tangible commitment by the City will have to come back to the City.

No one spoke against the project. The public hearing was closed.

REGULAR AGENDA

Consider Request by Council Member Charles Taylor for Employee Survey – (Exhibit G)

Council Member Taylor passed out some information regarding an employee survey. He presented Council with information from Greensboro along with a copy of the actual survey they conducted. At the end of this discussion, he wanted to propose something to be voted on tonight.

Mr. Taylor said that we have talked about employee surveys since 2007. At that time, Council chose not to pursue implementing the survey. One thing he has seen in his own environment at the manufacturer that he works with is, they incorporated an employee survey strategy and it has worked out to be a very nice tool, not only from a management standpoint on how to manage the business but also how to manage your people.

Mr. Taylor stated that there are three people in the State of North Carolina with the Employment Security Commission that are tasked with the Labor Market Developers. There are three representatives that do this type of survey; Sara Williams is the representative for the western part of the state up to Greensboro; Greg Schvez in Smithfield, and there is a representative in Eastern North Carolina. Mr. Taylor added that Mayor Olive mentioned in 2007 that she thought the Employment Security Commission of North Carolina conducts these surveys. This is not handled out of the local office; the city's would be handled out of Smithfield. They have offered to do the survey free of charge.

Mr. Taylor talked specifically about Greensboro's survey. Greensboro's survey consisted of 80 multiple choices questions. There were three open-ended questions that were presented. Twenty-three departments were identified and they sent out 3,009 employee letters. The survey went on-line from February 16 to March 6; 1,667 people participated so about 55 percent of the people participated. All 80 statements were on a scale of 1 to 4 being strongly agree, agree, disagree, to strongly disagree. They took the responses from the top two and combined the percentage for positive responses. They dealt with ten work life-categories; they dealt with supervisory, management, city council, employee relations, commitment to the City of Greensboro, pay and employee benefits, work group, job satisfaction, training and performance appraisal. Sixty-five percent or greater had satisfaction.

Mr. Taylor said there were four areas that fell below 65 percent; management was one of them at 55.9 percent; city council was at 26.9 percent; employee relations was 48.5 percent, and pay/employee benefits was 59.1 percent. He spoke to the people in Greensboro and they said they had a significant spike in employee morale after their survey was conducted. They are strongly endorsing this to be an annual process. Many municipalities including the City of Durham and City of Smithfield have incorporated this into their annual policy for their employees. He stated that often times people have a defense mechanism immediately when it comes time to conducting such a survey. The employees really feel like they have a voice after these surveys. The three open-ended questions that were asked by the City of Greensboro were, what are two things you feel the management of the City of Greensboro should start doing; what are two things you feel the management of the City of Greensboro should stop doing; and what are two things that you feel the management of the City of Greensboro should continue doing? The fact is we are trying to present a tool to the employees where they can feel they have a voice. He added that one thing most effective when these surveys were conducted, was when they had

groups that consisted of elected officials and employees working through the top ten or fifteen issues in each respective group. They set up in pods and they really broke it down and saw how they could really work better. Mayor Olive asked how they achieved confidentiality. Mr. Taylor replied that confidentially is done through the Employment Security Commission; they have three different mechanisms by which they can do surveys. You can mail the survey in, and they can give each employee a coded pass code that is only available for that particular employee through the North Carolina Employment Security Commission. They can also come in and conduct live surveys with individuals within closed buildings or off site. Confidentiality is the utmost importance. The Employment Security Commission tallied the results and presented them to municipalities.

Mayor Olive asked if the Employment Security Commission came before Council with the results. Mr. Taylor replied they did. The results tell you where the strengths were, etc.; they broke it down by group and segment of questions.

Mr. Taylor said that he has looked at over 200 different surveys around the country and there are rules that govern municipal government in North Carolina.

Mayor Pro Tem Stone stated that during his brief work in the corporate environment of about 11 years, they did several of these employee opinion surveys. His only concern is the fact that we have government looking over government. Although he did not encourage spending money, he encourages the fact that if he is going to do one, he wants to do it right. He would strongly consider a private company doing the survey. An opinion of his is that private companies seem to have a little more at stake at providing you with the best up-to-date information. One of things they learn from these employee opinion surveys is there is going to be a lot of negative things said; we know to expect this every year. Mr. Stone said that he did not know if government understands that negativity will come with an employee survey. Private companies understand this and they are able to relate the root of the message stronger. He is in favor of doing an employee survey but he is not hype on doing one with government overseeing what we are doing with the government. Mayor Olive responded that she thinks the first survey that is done should be done free. Mr. Stone said that Mr. Taylor mentioned that people will be given a code; one of the things they realize is that any link to break with the code to any employee somewhat kept people from filling the survey out. If you want to make it effective and weed out the “garbage”, it has to be random and not a code. He went through 11 years of these things and 7 years in management, if you want them done, you cannot put a code on it because they feel they have the code and know what the person is going to say.

Mr. Taylor stated that one thing the ESC does is they provide you three options. You can pick the option. If you want to go to strictly pay for survey and let someone pick one, you can. If you want to do a live survey or a combination, you are open to do whatever you decide to do as criteria. One thing he wanted to hit on the confidentiality; he checked on some of the references on the people they have conducted surveys for. He heard no problems at all with the employee input where, in many cases, these surveys were done for the first time through the Employment Security Commission. This is an outstanding tool. He has spoken with people from the Institute of Government that support this type survey. They are very careful that the

employees do not feel they are in a threatened situation but they are in a relaxed process. Confidentiality is maintained throughout and that assurance is given.

Council Member Sam Gaskins stated that he has worked on performance reviews and surveys from three sides for Pfizer. He has seen how it works. You get a lot of petty complaints immediately, but after it has been in service over two years, you really get some extremely valuable information. He has had a government run survey run on him each semester which he gets reviewed on his performance. The questions for the most part are 1 through 4 and you get percentages and you can evaluate your performance; it is not just worrying about somebody else evaluating your performance. You evaluate your own performance by seeing the response and you can tell where you are weak and you can make efforts to improve your own performance. The open-ended questions are extremely valuable. He learned in the early years very much about how to improve his performance; things that were not working well and things that might work better. You quickly see those things disappear when you get that kind of feedback. The reason he wanted to bring this up is because he could assure you government run or any other kind of run that it is extremely anonymous whether there is a key to let you enter into a program or not; there is no way he could ever find out where the results came from. The results are extremely anonymous. He said that he completes surveys. They give employee surveys on their own department heads or supervisors. The supervisors are surveyed and he has never had any question about there was security breach. They do outsource some for the institution; he is not sure if it is a government run survey.

Mr. Taylor said that one thing he has talked with council about is the concern over what questions can be asked and what forum this can be presented in. He took this up with the Institute of Government where he spoke with Maureen Burner, who is a ten-year veteran of the Institute. She specializes in survey methodology; research methods for public administration. citizen participation, apply statistics, as well as civic involvement. She assures him there is no mechanism for recourse. She is very well versed in this arena and she encouraged department heads to embrace this tool. This tool is not a detriment and the questions are not a detriment. The questions can be facilitated. This employee survey was passed along to the Institute of Government as well. It passed that test from a Greensboro standpoint. He spoke with Bob Joyce with the Institute of Government. Mr. Joyce specializes in government employer, employer relations, employment discrimination laws; school law, legislative representation, and news media and government relations. He said there is very little risk to municipalities and he encouraged to go anonymous. He spoke with Willow Jacobson at the Institute of Government. He contacted Tommy Wood who is the city attorney for Greensboro. He is a 25 plus year veteran in municipal government law. He spent 22 years as a deputy city attorney for the City of Greensboro and is recognized as a law expert in municipal matters. Mr. Wood did not recognize any heightened risks based on employee questions. Mr. Wood's assistant attorney, Becky Peterson, said to expect to take action based on results. There were no negatives; nothing concerning question content; immediate increase in employee morale; it was one of the best tools that they have ever put in place in municipal government.

Mr. Taylor said with that said, he would like to make a motion that we enter into an agreement with Employment Security Commission for no fee to conduct the survey and adopt the questions that the City of Greensboro has passed, and to make sure that we do everything

necessary and everything possible we can in our power to follow up and make sure that we utilize this tool wisely. Seconded by Council Member L. I."Poly" Cohen, the vote was in favor four to one with Council Member James Williams casting the dissenting vote.

City Attorney Patterson started that Mr. Taylor provided in Council's packet for review prior to this meeting, information regarding surveys that were done by city councils or by cities, conducted toward citizens with citizens' satisfaction with city services. Those were done by Durham, Pitt County, Winston-Salem, and Concord. Those are surveys that a city does to determine whether their citizens are happy with the services provided. The Institute of Government believes wholeheartedly in citizen surveys because you are asking your customers if they are receiving city services that they feel happy with; if they have changes they would like to suggest; or if they want a certain bond to support an infrastructure improvement, like a water plant; or what kind of recreation and parks departments did you want? However, Attorney Patterson said that she understood that he spoke with different attorneys about this. She stated that if you look at the City of Greensboro survey that he just passed out, (that she has just seen it as it was just passed out to council and she has not had the opportunity to review it) it appears to be from the city manager. There are a couple of new members on this board that have not heard what she has said in the past regarding employment surveys when it was brought up previously. They are a management tool for management of employees. There is a privacy issue with information regarding employee/personnel records and employee/information and the statutes say that basically any information gathered about employees is a personnel matter and is confidential and that employee matters are in the purview of management. She is trying to make sure that Council is aware of the limitations on them. The law does not allow council members to act as managers. If management wants to use a tool, they are entirely able to do that for managing the employees. Feedback is always good; people are interested in that and want to know what is out there. Attorney Patterson advised that she did not hear Mr. Taylor's conversations with the other people he consulted and he did not tell her about them before this meeting.

Attorney Patterson explained that she did not know if the people he consulted advised him, based on a city council conducting this survey, or as a management tool. A management tool is something that is appropriate and the city council should only be aware that there are some limitations on the involvement that they can have with city employees; that is what council hired the professional manager to do. She is not trying to throw any wet blankets or not trying to be receptive to ideas, in this situation. She felt like the new members need to know that when the city council members act like a manager, there are problems with that. The manager is the one that deals with the employees. It is true the ESC in many places conducts these surveys for free, but they are requested to do so by management. This is the point that she felt council should be aware of so that they do not do something inadvertently incorrect and have consequences because of that.

Mr. Taylor addressed Mrs. Patterson's concern. He said this was brought up to the Council of Greensboro. These ideas originated from a City Council retreat. The City of Henderson actually requested a survey just like this of their employees. He said that the Smithfield survey was conducted for the employees and the citizens which is the second phase of

his motion tonight. Once Council votes on this motion, he wants to have a second motion to deal with the prospects of looking at a city-based survey, in the future, of citizens.

Mr. Gaskins added that the price recommends the survey.

The vote was four to one in favor with Council Member James Williams casting the dissenting vote.

Mr. Taylor said that Council did not have to make a commitment tonight on the citizens' survey regarding services, etc.

Approval of Budget Ordinance Amending the City of Sanford Water and Sewer Utility Rate Schedule for Fiscal Year 2010 – 2011 – (Exhibit H)

Mayor Pro Tem Stone asked for this ordinance to be pulled off the consent agenda tonight. He understands the importance of passage of this by July 1 or earlier so we can figure out how we will incorporate the changes into the cycle billing. He wanted to bring this back to our Law and Finance meeting, prior to voting on this issue, so we can look at encouraging conservation. We talked about conservation and how it was going to cost our citizens but we are also trying to beautify our neighborhoods.

Mayor Pro Tem Stone made the motion to table this matter tonight until we have further discussion at Law and Finance meeting on the possibilities of alternative water for our citizens within the city limits. Seconded by Council Member Charles Taylor, the motion carried in favor with a three to two vote with Council Members James Williams and L. I. "Poly" Cohen casting the dissenting votes.

Approval to Unfreeze a Front Desk Position in the Police Department

Council Member Sam Gaskins said the reason he wanted this removed from the consent agenda was because at the Law and Finance meeting, he mentioned that we have added four new officers to the stimulus package; we have had a reported 37 percent decrease in crime rate; we already have more police officers than the national average; and in speaking with Mr. Hegwer, he has agreed that all three of those are accurate. He would not be opposed to moving an underutilized clerical person from another department if that is a problem; if they feel it is needed. We are already predicting lower sales tax revenues so this is not the time to add a new employee. He heard the argument that people do not want to see a police officer behind that desk; his feedback is that he heard a lot of comments during the campaign and since the concerns that people have but no one has expressed to him a concern about who has been sitting behind that particular desk. He did not see where adding an additional person is going to make it more efficient. He realizes that we may not be using a police officer to his best advantage but by adding an additional person does not improve efficiency. It only decreases efficiency. He is strongly against unfreezing that desk position at this point in time.

Mr. Taylor asked if we had surveyed our departments to see where anybody could possibly be moved to that position. Mr. Hegwer reminded Council that some time ago we applied for a grant to fund four additional officers; it was a federal grant through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. Our goal with the grant was that we hired four additional

officers – one person per shift and the overall goal in the grant, once we had the four officers, was that we have eight beats within the city. The city is divided up into eight areas. We moved to nine beats, making the areas smaller per beat. As we went to that, we applied for this federal grant to get the officers and as part of that grant, they want to see performance. There is a performance goal in the grant that we do what we say we are going to do. We asked for money to add additional officers. We had 81 officers and added 4, making it 85 sworn officers. We have increased patrol in an effort to work in areas, typically in the higher crime areas, to try to suppress crime with more patrol officers on shift. As part of that grant, we were to interact more with our community police; we work the same officers typically in the same beats, giving more presence, more interaction with the community, minimizing the area that you are covering so it gives you more visibility, more ability to see what is happening out there.

Mr. Hegwer said that we froze those two positions. We had four positions to cover that administrative front desk and it is there 24 hours per day for the public's access. We froze two positions because we had injured officers and it was a good opportunity for those officers to float back to the desk. Many are injured or undergoing some type of doctor's care so that they can get back into the workforce and they are a real asset for us because they know the field pretty well. We do not have the maximum amount of officers in the field that we can have. There was some real concern that we are trying to strive to make our crime rate even lower; we do not want to see those officers sitting there because we want them in the field. Those front desk positions are not paid as much as a police officer. He is concerned, from what he has read in the grant, that we may be in jeopardy of losing the grant if we do not fulfill the reason for the grant.

Mayor Olive asked how would it be a risk to the grant putting an underutilized person from another department at the front desk? Mr. Hegwer replied that he did not know of anybody that we have underutilized because we have not gotten into this year's budget but there are still positions that are frozen in this year's budget. He did not know how we could cover the front desk in the police department for 24 hours per day; there is no way. There are two positions open and we are asking to unfreeze one more. In the budget next year, he is asking to unfreeze the other one. The Police and Fire Departments are fully budgeted for next year.

Mr. Gaskins asked if these positions were frozen before we received the grant money. Mr. Hegwer replied yes. Mr. Gaskins said that he did not see how unfreezing them or leaving them frozen would affect the grant money. Secondly, he asked what are we planning to do with those four officers at the end of the three years that the federal government pays for. Mr. Hegwer replied that we plan to take them on. Mr. Gaskins said that by the time it is in attrition to cover that or do we plan on expanding the budget. Mr. Hegwer replied expanding the budget. Mr. Gaskins stated that we are just sliding it in here where we are going to expand the budget, which is exactly what his concern is. Mr. Hegwer replied that as part of the grant requirement, to fund them for one year; you are not required to go beyond that. One of the things we have always said is that we have not hired officers and say you are going to be here temporarily. Mayor Olive said that don't you anticipate some resignations and some retirement. Mr. Hegwer replied yes; there is always going to be some turnover. Mayor Olive said that those officers could go into that.

Council Member Sam Gaskins made the motion to not approve the unfreezing of the front desk personnel. Seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Stone, the motion passed with a three to two vote with Council Members James Williams and L. I. "Poly" Cohen casting the dissenting votes.

Approval to Purchase 911 Consoles and Furniture off Federal Contract – (Exhibit I)

Mayor Pro Tem Stone asked for this item to be moved from the consent agenda. In the Law and Finance meeting, we talked about these as two separate purchases. Today, they have been included in the consent agenda as one. Although he is a proponent of technology, he has not been overwhelming satisfied with our furniture. He is not happy with $13,500 per desk. He cannot sell the idea to anyone in the community. Mr. Hegwer said that this is for the apparatus, equipment, tables and all the accessories that the 911 equipments sits in itself.

Mayor Pro Tem Stone made the motion to not approve the purchase of 911 consoles and furniture. The motion failed due to the lack of a second.

Council Member L. I. "Poly" Cohen made the motion to approve the purchase of 911 consoles and furniture off federal contract. Council Member James Williams seconded the motion. Mr. Taylor said that he shared the same sentiments that Council Member Stone shared; however, the one deciding factor for him is that the fact that we were very judicious in looking at the process of getting the cost down. We were around $72,000 before the amortization schedule was included making it $97,000 to $98,000. We were able to get it down to around $50,000 and we were able to save about $45,000 through the GSA contract. Based on the quality of product the city is getting and the price that we are paying, we are getting a very good price that will last for years.

The motion carried in favor to purchase the consoles and furniture off federal contract by a four to one vote with Mayor Pro Tem Stone casting the dissenting vote.

OTHER BUSINESS

Council Member Cohen stated that he signed the no tax pledge but the water and sewer does not come under that. That is a private entity and we have to make money in water and sewer so we can expand and keep it going so people 20 years from now are not going to run out of water because we were stupid enough not to raise the water rates to expand the plant. Somebody 20 years ago did it for us. We need to do it for somebody else and Mr. Clark needs to understand where the water and sewer projects go. He hoped we are not going to raise taxes when Council gets their budget.

Council Member Taylor stated that he wanted to talk about speed in some of the neighborhoods such as Fairway Woods and possibly Mr. Williams's ward where a lot of kids are playing and people are walking. This was borne out of conversation with Police Officer Britt Young. Mr. Young made a point to him that often times when you are standing in your yard and somebody comes by, it is hard to judge the speed of that individual. He went into the historic district and they are complaining about speed. He asked an individual standing in the yard, if he would stand out there and he went by him. The individual said that Mr. Taylor was going 35 to 45 miles per hour and he was going 20 mph. He did not try the same experiment in Fairway Woods. He would like for staff to study this because there are a lot of ideas out in the

communities. He has heard speed bumps, crossings, children-at-play signs, and additional stop signs. He would like to study some of the speeds and the ability to hold a 20, 25 and 35 mile per hour speed. He will be the first to say that we have areas in each of our wards, that he would not drive 35 mph through a neighborhood. He would not do it in Westlanding, parts of Westlake, Carr Creek, Fairway Woods, and the historic district. There are a lot of areas that could benefit from a closer look at how speeds are affected in these communities.

Mayor Olive said that someone who lives off of Wilkins Drive said that it had become Wilkins Raceway and they had difficulty getting out of their driveways and the joggers and walkers along there are having a really hard time with the cars and trucks passing by so quickly. Mayor Olive said that maybe the equipment that measures how fast a vehicle is traveling could be put up in that vicinity.

Mayor Olive extended a word of appreciation from Council Member Walter McNeil, who has had surgery for their concern and Council Member Linwood Mann who we hope is completing his treatment for cancer. Mr. Mann's last treatment was yesterday.

Mr. Hegwer stated that hopefully staff will try to present Council with a proposed budget at next Wednesday's Law and Finance.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

Respectfully submitted,

_____

CORNELIA P. OLIVE, MAYOR

ATTEST:

_____

BONNIE D. WHITE, CITY CLERK