

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, October 19, 2010, at 7:00 P.M. The following people were present:

| | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Mayor Cornelia P. Olive | Council Member L. I. (Poly) Cohen |
| Council Member Sam Gaskins | Council Member James G. Williams |
| Council Member Linwood S. Mann, Sr. | Council Member Walter H. McNeil, Jr. |
| City Manager Hal Hegwer | City Attorney Susan C. Patterson |
| City Clerk Bonnie D. White | |

Absent:

Mayor Pro Tem Mike Stone
Council Member Charles Taylor

Mayor Cornelia Olive called the meeting to order and delivered the invocation.

PUBLIC COMMENT – (Exhibit A)

Fanny Headen, residing at 2663 Colon Road, expressed concern that some property owners, citizens, and some business owners have talked to her about the Downtown Jonesboro parking situation. The parking problem has been in existence for some time. The concerns are as follows: (1) My customers complain because they cannot find a place to park; (2) Other parking lots in the area are too far away; (3) Senior citizens and persons with physical limitations have difficulty crossing Main Street using the existing parking lots. The problem seems to exist more in the West Main Street area. Most of those buildings are in operation and among the business owners, employees, and customers, there is not enough space to accommodate parking needs. The workers need parking so the businesses can operate. Problems arise when the business owners or employees park on Main Street, but the question is where do they park? There is only a small amount of space behind the buildings that the owners can occupy for parking and it is getting dangerous because of the traffic and congestion in that area. Too many people are trying to occupy the same space. Parking on Main Street or anywhere else not designated as public parking only gets them in trouble and that just brings more unnecessary trouble. The situation is getting worse because it is beginning to create tension and that makes it a bad situation for everyone. In summation, they need more parking in Jonesboro because the problem is not going away. In Council's good efforts to continue the growth and success for all of Sanford, please consider Jonesboro in your planning. A nice parking area would enhance all of Jonesboro and would benefit all businesses.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

City Manager Hal Hegwer requested to add a closed session to the Regular Agenda as Item 9D.

Council Member Linwood Mann made the motion to approve the amended agenda. Seconded by Council Member Walter McNeil, Jr. the motion carried unanimously.

CASES FOR PUBLIC HEARING: held jointly with the Planning Board.

Consideration of the City of Sanford Comprehensive Pedestrian Plan. – (Exhibit B)

Community Development Director Bob Bridwell stated that the two most important considerations that staff had in analyzing the pedestrian plan for the City included the fact that we wanted to make the City much more accessible for pedestrians, and secondly, the most important priority that this Council has is neighborhoods – making our neighborhoods good places to live and raise families and to interact with each other.

Downtown Development Manager II David Montgomery explained that we started the process in 2006 when we applied for a Pedestrian Planning Grant with the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT). We did not receive it that year; however, we were fortunate in the second year to submit a grant in late 2007 and received an award in the summer of 2008. The total grant amount was \$40,000 with the State paying \$28,000 and the City's match of \$12,000.

The City put out RFQs for qualified consultants in the fall of 2008 and after reviewing all qualified candidates, the City entered into an agreement with McGill & Associates in early 2009. This selection was done in conjunction with the Downtown Master Plan, which staff hopes to give to Council in the next couple of months. They held their first steering committee in March of 2009 and held a two-day public workshop in April 2009, in conjunction with the opening of the Farmer's Market and the bike race. They created a public survey that was sent out to citizens and received several good responses to it. They had a follow-up steering committee in July 2009 and in August 2009, there was an update by McGill and Associates to City Council during a Law and Finance Committee meeting. McGill and Associates spent the rest of 2009 gathering data and starting to draft a plan. Since early 2010, it has gone through several iterations because we had to submit it to several NCDOT divisions for their comments.

Mr. Montgomery advised that the development of the City of Sanford Comprehensive Pedestrian Plan was a collaborative effort that involved numerous stakeholders including the Sanford Steering Committee, the City of Sanford and Lee County staff, NC Department of Transportation, the general public, and the planners from McGill and Associates.

Mr. Montgomery personally thanked the members of the Steering Committee which were Ronnie Turner-the City of Sanford Planning Commission Chairman, Ray Covington, Joni Martin, Alan Dossenbach, the County staff, and Debbie Davidson-Lee County Senior Services Department. Mr. Montgomery added that Mr. Bridwell and he have been invited to several of Mrs. Davidson's steering committees for the COLTS Transportation Plan, John Payne-Director of Lee County Parks and Recreation Department, Reid Cagle-Transportation Director for Lee County Public Schools, Sandra Boyd-Health Education Supervisor for Lee County Public Health Department, NCDOT staff – Helen Cheney, Chuck Dumas, James Garner, David Roulette, City of Sanford staff Vic Czar, Magda Holloway, Paul Weeks, Police Major Kevin Gray, and Don Kovasckitz – GIS Director.

Mr. Montgomery presented Council Members with a synopsis of the plan for them to review to give staff feedback. Copies of the full plan are located on the City of Sanford website for review by Council and the public.

Mayor Olive opened the public hearing.

Mr. Montgomery introduced Mike Norris, with McGill and Associates, who gave a summary of the Comprehensive Pedestrian Plan as listed in Exhibit B. Mr. Bridwell added that in many cases you have to have an adopted plan when applying for grants. Mr. Norris stated that this plan will also be a North Carolina Department of Transportation document. The DOT will use this document when they make improvements to their streets, to identify the corridor to see what the City of Sanford has recommended in regards to bicycle or pedestrian improvements. Lee County is working on a transit plan with COLTS which will be coming to Council soon. Staff will need to get approval from Council very soon to do a Bicycle Plan with the County but the City will have to apply for that grant.

No one spoke in favor or in opposition. The public hearing was closed.

Consideration of a text amendment to the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) to include additional language to clarify the requirements for additions/expansions and changes of use. – (Exhibit C)

Assistant Director of Community Development Director Marshall Downey explained that this amendment is to Article 3, Sections 3.2.3.3 and 3.2.3.4. This is one of the most important tools the City has in its UDO. Mr. Downey referred to the REVISED Attachment A (Amendments to Section 3.2.3.3. and 3.2.3.4 which includes the amendments to the UDO). When developers are doing additions/expansions to existing structures, they will be required to bring them up to the UDO requirements based on the impact to the building. There are three impacts: low impact additions/expansions, moderate additions/expansions, and substantial additions/expansions. Low impact additions/expansions are defined as an addition that equates to less than 25 percent to the total gross floor area of a site and requires less than 10 additional off-street parking spaces. Low impact projects require minimal UDO standards. Moderate additions/expansions are defined as an addition that is greater than 25 percent but less than 50 percent total of the total gross floor area. Moderate impact projects require greater compliance with the UDO. Substantial additions/expansions are defined as additions that equate to 50 percent or more of the total gross floor area of a site. Substantial impact projects require compliance with all UDO standards.

Mr. Downey explained that 3.2.3.4. sets forth rules for when an existing development wants a “change of use.” The UDO provides two categories for these minor and major changes of use. Minor changes of use are those where a change of land use has occurred; however, the change does not trigger new parking or triggers new parking but the amount is less than 10 spaces. A major change of use is one which triggers ten or more new parking spaces and results in greater compliance with the design standards of the UDO. He stated that staff has proposed language that needs to be added to the UDO listed in the REVISED Attachment A - Amendments to Section 3.2.3.3. and 3.2.3.4 to address the minor and major changes of use

regarding parking areas, architectural design standards for projects located along major corridors, and the screening of solid waste storage areas (dumpsters).

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

Consideration of a text amendment to the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) to clarify the term side yard setback for lots that have more than one street frontage. – (Exhibit C)

Assistant Director of Community Development Director Marshall Downey explained that Section 4.7.3.2. provides language for setbacks on a lot that has more than one street frontage. One of the ambiguities in the current language is that it does not specify what the setback is for a “street side yard”, so staff is recommending that language be added to clarify that a street side yard setback shall be considered the same as a front yard and shall meet the respective front yard setback.

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

Consideration of a text amendment to the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) to remove language that is vague and in conflict with the City’s Public Works policies regarding access roads for sanitary landfills. – (Exhibit C)

Assistant Director of Community Development Director Marshall Downey stated that Section 5.20 of the UDO is a portion of the ordinance that deals with sanitary landfills. It has specific design standards in addition to the normal ordinance standards that address what would be required if they were creating a new landfill. More specifically Section 5.20.2.4 gives specifics about what the minimum standards are for the new road for ingress and egress to the landfills.

He said that staff recently had an example where a developer was recently proposing to put in a land clearing and inert debris landfill (LCID) in our community. In doing so, we had worked through the technical review committee, public works, and engineering department about the road and how it would be accessed. Staff has stricken from Section 5.20.2.4. the following language in italics: *Within the incorporated areas of the County, roads shall conform to the requirements of Article 10 of this ordinance. Roadway design shall allow a weight limit of nineteen thousand (19,000) pounds per axle* and added the following language in italics: *Within the incorporated areas of the County, roads shall conform to the respective design standards of the City of Sanford Engineering Department or Town of Broadway Public Works Department.* In talking with the City engineers, the standard is a reasonable standard but it is not comprehensive enough. This would refer to all the street design standards of the City.

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

Consideration of a text amendment to the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) to increase the requirement for cul-de-sac pavement radius for City streets from the current 40 feet (80' diameter) to 45 feet (90' diameter). – (Exhibit C)

Assistant Director of Community Development Director Marshall Downey explained that this amendment addresses the cul-de-sac streets and how they are to be designed, particularly in residential areas. Over the past several Technical Review Committee (TRC) meetings, Sanford Fire Department Division Commander/Fire Marshal Ken Cotten, approached members of the TRC about the need to increase the current size of our cul-de-sacs. The current cul-de-sac is a 40-foot radius in terms of pavement width with a 45-foot right of way. After a couple of meetings with the fire department staff and Bill Rogers, the Lee County Fire Marshal, they agreed that because of the size of the emergency response vehicles, that there is a need to increase the size of the cul-de-sacs.

The new language for Section 6.7.1.4.2 would read: The radius for the circular terminus, or turnaround, shall be not less than 45 feet of pavement width, with a minimum right-of-way radius of 50 feet. If the pavement radius exceeds fifty (50) feet, an island may be planted in the center of the turnaround. The island shall have a minimum radius of 10 feet.

The Lee County Board of Commissioners held public hearings for the five proposed amendments. There was opposition stated at the public hearings against this amendment and the Lee County Planning Board decided to table this item based partly on the fact that the employees with the Lee County Fire Marshal's office were in training and unable to attend that meeting.

Mayor Olive opened the public hearing.

Council Member L. I. "Poly" Cohen stated that a cul-de-sac is usually in a residential section. If there is a house fire, we don't need the hook and ladder truck to go to that fire so how much room does it take in the cul-de-sac to turn the medium size truck around to fight the fire? Mr. Ken Cotten replied that their first-out engine is the aerial ladder and due to the changes in construction of houses today, anything 30 feet or higher, they have to respond with that ladder truck. The way new residential homes and neighborhoods are built, they have to respond with the ladder truck.

Mayor Olive asked if the width of the cul-de-sacs has any bearing on the insurance rates. Mr. Cotton replied that as the fire department being able to respond with a vehicle and getting into the end of the cul-de-sac, he has not spoken with any insurance companies to see if there is any effect. ISO, as part of the point system, with the 30 feet that you have to respond with the ladder truck. He will be glad to check into it. Mayor Olive replied that she did not want to compromise safety.

No one spoke in favor of the amendment.

Van Groce, Jr., stated that he will not say that he is speaking necessarily against it, but he has some concerns as a builder and developer. He said that as a builder one of the things they get into is costs and costs to their customers but they also get into questions about impervious surface, water quality. They get into some beautification issues you talked about tonight. On

one hand we have beautification saying let's have smaller streets, more density, more greenway, and then we talk about going into a residential subdivision and putting a 20-foot wide street with a 90-foot teardrop. That is a lot of difference; 80 feet is a lot of difference. He understands trying to get to a fire for someone on the cul-de-sac; however, primarily the need of a cul-de-sac width is to leave the scene. If you drive down a cul-de-sac, you either got to the fire or you are on the wrong street. He would like for someone to tell him what the benefit is. Mr. Groce said the question is, what does that cost us for the ease of use and does it make it more accessible? He said if it is a safety issue, it should be considered.

With no one else requesting to speak, the public hearing was closed.

Consideration of a text amendment to the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) to add language to include specific roadway segments which parallel roadways that are identified as a freeway/expressway or a thoroughfare on the City of Sanford/Lee County Thoroughfare Plan within the area designated for compliance with design standards for non-residential development.

– (Exhibit C)

Assistant Director of Community Development Director Marshall Downey referred to Exhibit C regarding Section 10.7 of the UDO listing the highways and roadways that are subject to design standards. He explained that when a new business comes into town and would like to build along the listed corridors, staff applies additional aesthetics design standards to make it a more attractive gateway/streetscape. Something staff discovered is there are certain portions of U. S. Highway 1 in the City that have no access; it is basically controlled access and there are several segments of streets that parallel the highway and act essentially as a service road for U. S. 1. These service roads should be subject to specific design standards like the corridors are subject to and this amendment includes language to add certain streets to Section 10.7.2.3.

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

The Planning Board retired to the West End Conference Room.

Public Hearing on North Plank Road Waterline Extension Assessment – (Exhibit D)

Mayor Olive opened the public hearing.

City Engineer Paul Weeks advised that in July 2008, the State Legislature gave the City of Sanford the authority to assess affected individuals for the construction of waterline extensions within Lee County. In September 2010, City staff was approached by a number of property owners on North Plank Road who submitted a petition. The petition was signed by just over 57 percent of the affected property owners, which represented just over 51 percent of the affected acreage. Based on that criteria, it meets the City's policy for consideration of the petition assessment. Those individuals are requesting that we consider a petition assessment for the area so they can get a waterline extension. On September 21, 2010, City Council entered into a preliminary resolution with regard to the extension. The resolution defined the project, outlining how it would be assessed and also stated that the public hearing would be held October 18, 2010, at 7 P.M. The resolution was sent to all affected parties on September 24 as evidenced

by the certificate of mailing in council's packet. On September 28, a notice of public hearing was run in the *Sanford Herald*.

Mr. Weeks explained that tonight, staff had hoped to present to Council at the end of the public hearing for consideration of a resolution to direct the project be undertaken, as well as, the award of the bid. However, staff became aware during the process that there may be some opposition to the project; therefore, no vote will be taken. At the next Law and Finance meeting, staff will submit the resolution to direct the project be undertaken and award of bid for the project.

Marc Clark, who works for Lee County General Services, spoke in favor. He introduced Lee County General Services Director Russell Spivey, and Lee County Commissioner Ed Paschal. He said that the commissioners think this is an important project and that the people in that area really need water. They have had a hardship for some time. Many of them share wells and some have water hauled to their home on a regular basis. They received some grant money from the North Carolina Rural Center to assist with this project. They want to show their support for the project.

Ed Paschal, Lee County Commissioner, spoke in favor. He stated that he has worked long and hard trying to get water to the residents on North Plank Road. These people have been out of water for a long time. He asked for the residents in the audience who need water on North Plank Road to stand up. Twelve people stood.

Daniel Logan, residing at 832 North Plank Road, spoke in favor. He has a couple of poultry houses and he has been short on water for several years. He has to haul a lot of water to his site. Several years ago when the County presented this waterline, he was signed up for it and thought it was a done deal but somehow when the City took it over, it got lost. They were promised water years ago by the County.

Kimberly Jones, residing at 530 North Plank Road, spoke in favor. She is one of the residents who do not have water. She has to have water hauled in every four to six weeks. She has to pay somebody to bring the water to her. Her well collapsed and she has a water tank that pumps water into her house.

Patrick Lindsey, residing at 398 North Plank Road, spoke in favor. He has dug three wells and has no water. He spent almost \$10,000 in wells and has no water. The neighbor across the street wanted to build a house and dug four wells and has no water. They need the waterline extension because there is no water.

William Stewart, residing at 163 North Plank Road, spoke in opposition. He said that when this project first came available in 2007 when they first started the water system out to Plank Road to Carbonton Road, he was one of the first to sign up for the water. He asked if they would continue the waterline across to his corner of property, which is on the corner of North Plank Road and Carbonton Road. He told them he would pay for them to carry the water across to his property just to install the line and he would take the water from there up to where he lives at. They refused. He paid his money up front and they sent it back. He understands the people

need water. He does not need water because he had an artesian well dug. Mr. Stewart added that he did not have any objection with these people that need water but he did not feel that he should be assessed on his property for a waterline that he does not need. He said that if everybody needs it, he guess he had to go along with the project.

With no one else requesting to speak, Mayor Olive closed the public hearing.

Regular Agenda

Consider Resolution Authorizing the Advertisement of an Offer to Purchase and Move a House from the City of Sanford, North Carolina – (Exhibit E)

City Attorney Susan Patterson explained that the City has received an offer from Oldham House Movers to purchase a house located on property owned by the City for a sum of \$5,000 and to move that house, clear the disturbed area, and reseed the lot for a cost of \$5,000. Under the legal methods we have to sell property owned by the City, we would like to advertise this offer to purchase and move the house to see if anyone would upset that bid. The resolution authorizes the advertisement of the offer. It is a purchase price of \$5,000 and a cost of \$5,000 to clean up the disturbed area; so it would be a wash. At the end of ten days and if no upset bids are received, the City would execute the paperwork for the sale of the structure. The house is being sold “as is” and “where is” condition.

Council Member Walter McNeil, Jr. made the motion to adopt the Resolution Authorizing the Advertisement of an Offer to Purchase and Move a House from the City of Sanford, North Carolina. Seconded by Council Member L. I. “Poly” Cohen, the motion carried unanimously.

Consider ABC Compensation – (Exhibit F)

City Manager Hal Hegwer advised that we received a letter from the Alcoholic Beverage Control requesting that Council affirm their current compensation amounts. House Bill 1717 was passed in July 2010 and it states that all ABC board members compensation be adjusted to \$150 per meeting. They are requesting Council to affirm their current compensation amounts of \$400 for the chairman and \$250 for the other two board members each per month. This compensation was put in place in 2004. The new legislation, if we do not change or affirm their current compensation, will change to \$150 per meeting. They average one meeting per month but according to the issues they are involved in, the number of meetings can change.

Mayor Olive said it was difficult for her to justify their current compensation when we have so many other boards and commissions who meet monthly who are paid roughly \$25 for their service. Is there that much more work associated with the ABC Board? Mr. Hegwer could not quantify how much work those board members perform. The board is going to be under new requirements that the Legislature has put in place.

Council Member Gaskins stated that it would be nice to hear from our council member who represents the council on that board (who is not present tonight) about what happens during their meetings. His concern is who decides how many meetings they have; there could be a lot of meetings at \$150 per meeting. To turn over to anybody the opportunity to say you are being

paid so much a meeting and you figure out how many meetings you want to have, is something he felt was not a good idea.

Mayor Olive asked why the change was made by the Legislature. Attorney Patterson replied that there was a wholesale rewrite of many aspects of the ABC System. Recommendations were made by the joint study commission on the Alcoholic Beverage Control at the Legislature. They changed many different aspects of it. Some of this came on the heels of negative press and incidences that occurred with alcoholic beverage control in other areas that dealt with nepotism and having employees that were related, and incidences of suppliers and vendors providing functions that the board members attend. One of the changes that was made was this ceiling that was placed on compensation. As of October 1, if a local ABC Commission is paid something different than the \$150, then a vote would need to be taken to affirm that. Mr. Dowd is requesting that vote from this Council to confirm what they have been receiving. If you choose not to take that action, then they would have to come into compliance with the new ceiling.

Mayor Olive stated that she would like to know how many meetings they normally attend and how long the meetings last.

After much discussion, Council Member McNeil, Jr., made the motion to table this decision. Council Member Sam Gaskins seconded the motion. Council Members voting for the motion to table were Charles Taylor, Sam Gaskins, and Walter McNeil. Council Members voting against the motion were Linwood Mann and L. I. "Poly" Cohen.

Consider Discussion Regarding Railroad Crossing (Chatham Street)

City Engineer Paul Weeks explained that to recap what they talked about, the Department of Transportation approached the City and stated that the Chatham Street railroad crossing rose to a level of concern where they think an additional treatment is necessary. They indicated that the treatment would be railroad crossing gates. They asked us if the City would like to be involved with the project. The City's involvement would be that the Federal Highway would pay 90 percent of the installation cost and the City would commit to paying 10 percent of the cost. Going forward, the City would pay 50 percent of the maintenance cost and the railroad pays the other 50 percent. The cost for the railroad gates are estimated at \$200,000 for engineering and installation. The City's portion of the cost would be about \$20,000. We asked the Department of Transportation a series of questions as to what is involved with the construction; has the railroad been involved in this; why did this particular crossing rise to the top. Staff questioned the D.O.T. and they felt additional treatment is necessary.

Mr. Weeks said that should City Council decide to proceed with the project, the D.O.T. would send us an agreement saying the City would share in the costs – 90 percent/10 percent. Once they have designed it and have an actual cost, they would send us another letter saying this is the actual cost and are you still interested? If we say yes, they will proceed; if we say no, the City would be responsible for the engineering costs they have accumulated to date. Based on previous projects, the D.O.T. says that engineering costs run around \$6,000.

Mr. Weeks stated that the City's annual maintenance costs would be \$1,532. The D.O.T. looks at this every five years to see if this cost is reasonable. This past year the cost went up 19 percent to \$1,532. Five years previous, it went up 13 percent; five years before that it went up 8 percent. These are true maintenance costs - changing of light bulbs, cleaning things and electronics. Things like vandalism and accidents are not paid for out of this. If someone vandalizes it or is hit in an accident, it is the railroad's responsibility to get those costs back.

Mr. Weeks said a question was asked about the cost difference between flashing lights and flashing lights with the gates, and the answer he received is "not much." The only thing you are not putting in between the two are the arms and the candlelever. A question was asked if the City decides we do not want to participate, what happens? Mr. Weeks stated that every few years, the D.O.T. reruns the program that they have and some cities do say no and it does not pull them from the list. After two years, the prioritization might change and you may or may not get another letter.

Mr. Weeks stated that staff is looking for direction from the Council if they would like to participate or not in this project. Mr. Gaskins asked, "Why did the State think that this crossing became so critical?" Mr. Weeks replied there were several responses. One was it is not a 90 degree crossing; because it is somewhat skewed when people pull up to it looking left and right, it is a little more difficult. There is a building there which they feel could be in the way of site distances. Based on their field observations, they said that two to three trains use it a day and there is also pedestrian traffic in that area. Based on this and a statewide survey of all railroad crossings, this particular crossing has risen to the level to where they sent the City the letter.

Council Member Linwood Mann made the motion to leave it like it is and not participate. Seconded by Council Member Walter McNeil, Jr., the motion carried unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS

Council Member Sam Gaskins thanked Community Development Director Bob Bridwell and staff for putting together the Pedestrian Plan with the appendices.

Mayor Olive stated that she rode around this afternoon with Carl Anglin, Code Enforcement Supervisor, and was elated by the improvements that have been made in East Sanford. Council Member Mann echoed Mayor Olive's comments. She said that where one person decided to upgrade a house, it appeared that the neighbors on both sides did the same thing. She hopes this will spread throughout East Sanford.

City Manager Hal Hegwer made Council aware of several handouts that were placed at Council's seats.

Closed Session

City Attorney Susan Patterson read a motion to go into closed session in accordance with N.C.G.S. 143-318.11(a)(5) to instruct the public body staff or negotiating agents concerning the position to be taken on the price or other material terms of a contract or proposed contract for the acquisition of real property by purchase, option, exchange, or lease. So moved by Council

Member Sam Gaskins, seconded by Council Member Walter McNeil, Jr., the motion carried unanimously.

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

RETURN TO REGULAR SESSION AND ADJOURNMENT

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

Respectfully submitted,

CORNELIA P. OLIVE, MAYOR

ATTEST:

BONNIE D. WHITE, CITY CLERK