

**CITY OF LAURINBURG
CITY COUNCIL MEETING
OCTOBER 18, 2022
CITY HALL AND POLICE DEPARTMENT
303 WEST CHURCH ST.
6:00 p.m.**

Minutes

The City Council of the City of Laurinburg held its regular meeting on Tuesday, October 18, 2022 in the Council Chambers of the City Hall and Police Department at 6:00 p.m. with the Honorable James T. Willis, Mayor, presiding. The following Councilmembers were present: Mary Jo Adams, Mary Evans, Rosemary Rainer, Barbara Rogers, and Andrew G. Williamson, Jr.

Also present were Charles D. Nichols III, City Manager; Jennifer A. Tippet City Clerk; and William P. Floyd, Jr., City Attorney.

Mayor Willis called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. He gave the Invocation and led the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Councilmember Evans requested that Item 3b, Consider Resolution No. R-2022-28 Findings of Fact for Special Use Permit on Old Johns Road be removed from the Consent Agenda down to Item 4 for discussion. She explained that “there needs to be something added since I went to the School Board meeting and some things occurred at that time. I think we need to have some other stuff put in either as an addendum or as an ordinance, or in our ordinance, or whatever that we have.”

Councilmember Adams explained that she would like to hear the City Attorney’s take on the request by Councilmember Evans since the quasi-judicial hearing had been held before making a change to the agenda. She added that she was at the School Board meeting and knows that there was some concern and questions by the School Board members.

Councilmember Evans stated, “I would like to make a motion that we move it down.”

The City Attorney asked if Council wanted to rule on the motion first or hear from him.

Councilmember Evans stated that she presided over the hearing, and she wants council to move the item down. She added that she presided over the hearing, and it was Council’s decision.

The City Attorney explained that if Councilmember Evans’ issue is that she wants Council to relitigate the hearing, the hearing has been held.

Councilmember Evans stated that was not the discussion.

The City Attorney explained if Council wanted to have a discussion, then that was fine.

Councilmember Evans stated, “I would like to make that motion.”

Councilmember Rogers stated, “I’ll second.”

Mayor Willis explained that the motion and second was to amend the agenda to take Item 3b off the Consent Agenda and move it to Item 4 on the agenda. He requested that the City Clerk call the roll.

The City Clerk called the roll as follows with responses as shown:

Councilmember Evans – Aye
Councilmember Rogers – Aye
Councilmember Williamson – No
Councilmember Rainer – Aye
Councilmember Adams - No

Mayor Willis explained that the motion carried three (3) to two (2).

Councilmember Williamson moved to approve the agenda with the revision just approved. Councilmember Rainer seconded the motion, and it was approved unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

Mr. Michael Chapman, Executive Director of Operations for Scotland County Schools, explained that he wanted to offer apologies from the Board of Education and from Dr. LeGrand for the miscommunication between the property owner, Scotland County, and the School District, concerning the Old Johns Road property and the “rezoning request that was done at a previous hearing.” He added that he was present tonight to ask on behalf of the School Board and Dr. LeGrand that a reconsideration be done for the property. He further added that the property is across the street from South Johnson School, and is an elementary school that everyone has enjoyed in the community. He further added that in this day and age being more concerned with school safety more than ever before, understanding exactly who the school’s neighbors would be and being able to protect the property 24/7. He further added that he believed that the situation warranted more consideration than a simple zoning referral.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mayor Willis reviewed the Consent Agenda:

- a) Consider minutes of August 16, 2022 regular meeting and September 20, 2022 regular meeting
- b) *REMOVED*

Councilmember Williamson moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Councilmember Adams moved to second the motion, and the vote was as follows:

Ayes: Williamson, Adams, Rainer, Evans, Rogers

Nays: None

CONSIDER RESOLUTION NO. R-2022-28 FINDINGS OF FACT FOR SPECIAL USE PERMIT ON OLD JOHNS ROAD

Councilmember Evans asked Mayor Willis if he minded if she led this discussion, to which Mayor Willis agreed to allow Councilmember Evans to lead the discussion.

Councilmember Evans explained that after reading the findings of fact that Council would be voting on tonight, she felt that there was some misleading information, or maybe some information that was left out that should be either on record or as part of the ordinance. She added that Council was told that the School Board was sent a letter about the public hearing; however, a School Board member indicated that they did not receive a letter, and the School Board Chairman said that this matter was a concern of the school. She further added that she did not know if Council could redo the hearing or reconsider the matter. She added that the School Board or Scotland County should be given an opportunity to address this issue because the School Board was not aware of the RV park, and that the members of the School Board might object to it. She further added that she was requesting that Council redo the hearing, and that "it is possible and has been done before." She added that "it is a dangerous situation" and on the news last week it was reported that "a young man came running out of the woods and shot at the school, and then ran back into the woods." She further added that "they (the School Board) were not given an opportunity to speak on it because they did not know about it. I know that Ms. Jenny said that she did send a letter to the County which is the property owner." She further added that she wanted to "give the School Board a chance to reflect and be a part of the conversation and wanted that noted in the minutes." She stated, "It has been done before."

The City Attorney requested that Councilmember Evans cite the case she talked about that has been redone.

Councilmember Evans replied that she did research on the computer. She added that she had called the UNC School of Government today.

Councilmember Rogers asked what the options of doing the hearing over were.

The City Attorney explained that there was no procedural mechanism in the City's Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) for a re-hearing on an approved special use permit. He added that there is a remedy available to an aggrieved party that has standing, which the City has faced before, and that remedy is the Superior Court.

The City Attorney asked Councilmember Evans if she was aware of any procedural irregularities with the hearing held last month.

Councilmember Evans responded that she was saying that all the information was not given, and it was misleading that the School Board knew about the hearing. She added that “it was quoted by someone, I don’t know whether it was the lawyer or the young man, but that the School Board knew.”

The City Attorney explained that he recalled that the applicant testified that he spoke to Dr. LeGrand (Scotland County School Superintendent) about the matter.

The City Attorney asked Councilmember Evans if she had any knowledge of whether the applicant spoke with Dr. LeGrand or not about the hearing. He also asked if there was any indication that the signs were not posted on the property.

Councilmember Evans replied that she “did not talk to the extent of the sign”.

The City Attorney asked Councilmember Evans if there was any indication or any reason why Scotland County did not forward the information to the School Board.

Councilmember Evans replied that she did not know if Scotland County received the notice or not.

The City Attorney explained that Scotland County was the owner of the property upon which the school is located and was served with notice of the public hearing.

Councilmember Evans asked Mr. Chapman if it was investigated whether Scotland County received a notice of the public hearing.

Mr. Chapman explained that he understood that a conversation was held after the Scotland County School Board meeting between Dr. LeGrand and the County Manager; however, neither the Superintendent nor members of the Board of Education received advance notice about the hearing.

The City Attorney asked Mr. Chapman if Dr. LeGrand did not mention the matter.

Mr. Chapman replied, “No sir.”

Councilmember Evans stated, “if we don’t do it tonight, can we, if it can be put on at another time, tonight or another time is fine.”

Councilmember Rogers asked Mr. Chapman what his title was.

Mr. Chapman replied that he was the Executive Director for Operations for the School District.

Councilmember Rogers asked what the options were for the school system.

The City Attorney replied that if it could be determined and if a court would agree that the School Board or Scotland County could join into the matter, any aggrieved party could appeal the decision to the Superior Court. He added that that is the remedy for a quasi-judicial hearing. He elaborated that it is not a judicial hearing in all manners in that if it were a trial, there are procedural rules that allow motions to be made such as for a judge to reconsider. He added that the Unified Development Ordinance does not contain such procedural actions for quasi-judicial hearings. He further added that once a decision is made on a quasi-judicial matter, the applicant has vested rights. He added that the hearing was held, the evidence was presented in the hearing and a decision was made. He further added that the Unified Development Ordinance does not provide for a reconsideration except if a special use permit is denied, there is a procedure for rehearing after 12 months if there is a significant change of circumstances. He further explained that if a special use permit is approved, he was not aware of any procedure available for Council to reconsider.

Councilmember Evans stated that she “was told by the School of Government that it can be at Council’s discretion.”

The City Attorney explained that each unified development ordinance is unique to each jurisdiction and that his interpretation of the City’s UDO is pretty clear.

Councilmember Evans stated that “maybe there needs to be a change to the Unified Development Ordinance to make sure that every party is involved and is actually notified. She added that, “I do know that you made an effort, but it didn’t go through. We made our effort; we did what we were supposed to do but it didn’t get to the right hands.”

The City Attorney explained that it was not unusual for the occupant of a property to not be the one to receive notice as there could be tenants involved. He added that for that reason, the property is posted. He further added that there was some responsibility associated with making an effort to investigate what is going on around property.

Councilmember Evans explained that she understood that, “but they didn’t see the sign. And the sign was not as visible as you would think it was.”

The City Attorney explained that the General Statutes and the Unified Development Ordinance says that every quasi-judicial decision shall be subject to review by the superior court by proceedings of the nature of certiorari. He added that the City has had cases appealed with the Superior Court before, and that is the remedy available to an aggrieved party. He added that he was not sure what the basis of the appeal would be, and that all procedural rules were followed.

Councilmember Evans explained that Council ruled on some misleading information “because we thought that those parties that were supposed to have been involved were involved, when in fact they didn’t even know it was taking place.”

The City Attorney asked if Councilmember Evans was referring to testimony given at the hearing.

She responded in the affirmative.

The City Attorney explained that Mr. Thomas Willis, the applicant, testified that he spoke to Dr. LeGrand.

The City Manager stated that the Planning Board (on August 9, 2022) asked Mr. Willis a question to which he responded that he had spoken with Dr. LeGrand about the matter. He added that the process for mailing notices and posting signs had been the same since he had been with the City. He added that notices are sent to all property owners within 200 feet of the subject property.

Councilmember Rogers stated that she thought that Council could agree that by procedure all bases had been covered. She added that she thought Council should give some concern as to how to address the school system who has not approached Council and said that it did not have adequate information to show up. She added that it appears to have fallen back on Dr. LeGrand not having disseminated the information to the School Board, and procedurally, she might not have been required to do so. She then asked if Council was going to allow the School Board to walk away with the answer that there was nothing Council could do, or if there was something that Council could offer as a solution.

The City Attorney explained that according to the Unified Development Ordinance, the School Board's remedy is clear. He added that Council does not have a provision about rehearing a special use permit, except if one has been denied. In this case, the petitioner must demonstrate that a substantial change in the proposal has occurred. He further added that if Council decides to rehear the request, then the aggrieved party would now be the applicant, and the applicant could go to Superior Court. The applicant would argue to the judge that he had his day in court before Council, according to the Unified Development Ordinance; that Council made a decision with all of the procedures followed; there was no contrary evidence presented; and that he is entitled to the special use permit. The City Attorney stated that he believed it would be a successful argument for the applicant.

Councilmember Evans stated, "we voted on not complete information."

The City Attorney stated that Council voted on the information that was presented.

Councilmember Williamson explained that the City Attorney had made it clear what the Unified Development Ordinance says. He added that if Council got into the habit of ruling one way and then someone comes up after the hearing expressing concerns and asks Council to redo the hearing, that this would not be a good procedure. He further added that he felt that Council heard the evidence that was presented and made a decision. He further added that he did not see any reason to do anything different.

Councilmember Evans stated that the issue and concern is public safety, public safety for children, and that was monumental.

Councilmember Williamson explained that the applicant, Mr. Willis, agreed to conduct criminal background checks. He added that safety was a legitimate concern, and it was addressed. He further added that given the procedures in the Unified Development Ordinance, there is not a possibility of redoing the hearing.

Councilmember Rogers asked Mr. Chapman if there was a specific ask that he had of Council.

Mr. Chapman stated that he was tasked by the Board of Education to ask for a reconsideration, especially since the property sits directly across from an elementary school. He added that he had studied educational law for many years, and “that there is the spirit of the law and there is the letter of the law.” He further added that he understands procedure. He concluded his comments by stating “in this day and time, which is completely different from the era I grew up in, I think that we need to err on the side of caution when it comes to the safety of our students.”

Councilmember Evans asked if there was any way to control to ensure that the applicant, Mr. Willis, does obtain background checks.

The City Attorney explained that there are various conditions that can be placed on a special use permit and if there is a violation of the condition(s), then the permit can be revoked. He added that if Council could establish that the background checks are not being done, that would be a violation of the permit.

Councilmember Evans stated that she would not want any child to get injured for any reasons and for it to fall on the public and the City as well. She added that there are other places to have an RV park. She stated that her concern was public safety and safety of the children.

The City Attorney pointed out that the hearing was a special use permit hearing and not a zoning change, and that there are different rules. He added that a zoning change is a legislative decision, but a quasi-judicial hearing is very limited in scope. He further added that a quasi-judicial hearing applies to very specific facts of a very specific use for a specific landowner. He explained that that is why the rules are strict and a quasi-judicial hearing is like being in court. He further explained that a landowner has Constitutional Rights and has the right to expect that the procedures will be followed. He concluded by stating that clearly the remedy available for the School Board is if it wants to appeal Council’s decision, then it can do so with the Superior Court.

Councilmember Evans directed the following question to a female in the audience: “Mrs. Jackson, do you have a comment?”

The response from the female could not be heard as she was not at the podium.

The City Clerk asked for the name of the female speaker for the record.

The female responded, “Vickie Jackson, member of the School Board.”

Councilmember Evans stated that she wanted to make a motion and see what happened. She then stated the following, “I want to make a motion that we give the School Board an opportunity to have a fair hearing, to redo this hearing whether Mr. Floyd wants to or not.” She added that she had discussed it with the School of Government and it has been done. She further added, “so if we want to bear that burden, I want to make a motion that we redo it again.”

Councilmember Rainer stated, “I’ll second it.”

The City Attorney stated that he wanted to go on record to say that the “motion was an improper motion. It is inconsistent with what the Unified Development Ordinance says about procedure, and that is his legal advice.”

Councilmember Evans asked, “Can we table this then?”

The City Attorney asked, table what?

Councilmember Evans replied, “Table this finalization, this UDO thing and the zoning and everything?”

The City Attorney explained that Council does not have to make the findings of fact at this time. He added that the procedural issues remain.

Councilmember Adams asked why Council would not vote on the findings of fact since they would not change.

The City Attorney explained that he was saying that from a time standpoint, there was no requirement for the findings of fact to be done this month.

Councilmember Evans explained that there was a motion and it had been properly seconded. She then asked, “what did we say?”

The City Clerk recited the following: “Motion to give the School Board an opportunity to have a fair hearing and to redo this hearing, whether Mr. Floyd wants to or not. I talked to the School of Government and it has been done.”

Mayor Willis asked if there had been second to the motion.

Councilmember Evans replied in the affirmative.

Mayor Willis requested that the City Clerk call the roll.

The City Clerk called the roll as follows with the responses:

Councilmember Evans – Aye

Councilmember Rainer – Aye
Councilmember Rogers – Aye
Councilmember Williamson – No
Councilmember Adams – No

Mayor Willis stated that the motion carried three (3) to two (2).

PUBLIC HEARINGS

CONSIDER AMENDING ARTICLE 6 ZONING DISTRICTS, SECTION 6.6 TABLE OF USES, ARTICLE 7 SUPPLEMENTAL REGULATIONS AND APPENDIX A DEFINITIONS OF THE CITY OF LAURINBURG UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCE

Mayor Willis opened the public hearing to consider amending Article 6 Zoning Districts, Section 6.6 Table of Uses, Article 7 Supplemental Regulations and Appendix A Definitions of the City of Laurinburg Unified Development Ordinance.

Mr. Mac McInnis, City Planner/Code Enforcement Officer, explained that Ms. Stephanie Bell has requested amending the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) to allow microblading as an acceptable use in the Central Business Zoning District and General Business Zoning District with approval of a special use permit. The amendments to the UDO include:

- Adding microblading to the Use Table which is Article 6 Zoning Districts Section 6.6 Table of Uses under retail sales and services. And would appear in the ordinance as SS under Central Business and General Business which means that approval of a special use permit by Council would be required.
- The use would also have the Supplemental Regulations which would be added to Article 7 which is Supplemental Regulations, Section 7.48. It would show as microblading Section 7.48.1 would state that the applicant must have certification illustrating the successful training for microblading.
- Appendix A is the definitions portion of the UDO and the definition of microblading which is semi-permanent technique for enhancing the appearance of eyebrows in which pigment is deposited into the skin.

Mr. McInnis explained that Planning Board heard this request on September 13, 2022 and voted unanimously to recommend approval of the amendments.

Ms. Stephanie Bell explained that she owns Bell House Beauty located at 126 South Main Street. She added that she would love to offer microblading services to her business. She further added that because ink is deposited into the skin, currently the definition falls under tattooing and tattooing is prohibited in the Central Business District.

There being no one to speak in opposition to the request, Mayor Willis closed the public hearing.

Councilmember Williamson moved to approve Ordinance No. O-2022-27 amending Article 6 Zoning Districts, Section 6.6 Table of Uses, Article 7 Supplemental Regulations, and Appendix A Definitions of the City of Laurinburg Unified Development Ordinance because:

- a) The proposed amendments to the UDO advance the public health, safety and general welfare.
- b) The proposed amendments are consistent with the comprehensive plan and any other adopted plan that is applicable because they reflect technical and substantive amendments to the Laurinburg Unified Development Ordinance in maintaining an updated UDO that will assist all citizens in the use and development of property within the City's planning jurisdiction.
- c) The proposed amendments to the UDO are reasonable and in the public interest because the amendments promote the public health and safety by providing the citizens with an updated UDO consistent with the Future Land Use Plan for the City of Laurinburg's growth in the Central Business and General Business zoning districts.

The motion was seconded by Councilmember Rainer, and the vote was as follows:

Ayes: Williamson, Rainer, Adams, Rogers, Evans

Nays: None

(copy of Ordinance No. O-2022-27 on file in city clerk's office)

CONSIDER EXTENDING THE CORPORATE LIMITS OF THE CITY OF LAURINBURG

Mayor Willis opened the public hearing to consider expanding the Corporate limits of the City of Laurinburg.

The City Manager explained that when staff was considering the location for the North Fire Station, it was known that the property would need to be annexed into the City. He added that the announcement earlier in the day for the location of SOPAKCO to be located adjacent to the North Fire Station site, staff was hoping that it would be annexed also.

There being no one to speak in favor of or against this matter, Mayor Willis closed the public hearing.

Mayor Willis explained that the SOPAKCO announcement was one of the best piece of news for the City and community. He added that it would purchase water and sewer from the City and if not located in the City limits, the costs would be higher.

Councilmember Adams moved to approve Ordinance No. O-2022-28 to extend the corporate limits of the City of Laurinburg, North Carolina. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Rainer, and the vote was as follows:

Ayes: Adams, Rainer, Rogers, Evans, Williamson

Nays: None

(copy of ordinance No. O-2022-28 on file in city clerk's office)

CITY MANAGER REPORTS

PAVEMENT CONDITION STUDY – MR. ROBERT WILSON, PE

The City Manager explained that the pavement condition study had been budgeted, and the purpose was to update the study conducted in 2016. He added that the study reviewed the condition of City-owned and maintained streets. He further added that the streets are ranked by priority of maintenance needs, and with funds budgeted for street resurfacing, staff uses the list to determine what streets are to be resurfaced or repaired.

Mr. Robert Wilson, P.E., of LaBella Associates, explained that in conducting the Pavement Condition Survey, all streets were driven and an assessment conducted. The assessment includes the type of distress found and the type of maintenance needed for each type of distress. He presented a PowerPoint with highlights as follows:

- Laurinburg maintains 91 miles of paved roads
- LaBella completed the survey portion in September 2022
- Data Collection
 - Alphabetical listing of all City streets and listing by type of distress in order from worst score to the highest score
- Eight common distresses
 - Alligator cracking
 - Block cracking
 - Reflective cracking
 - Raveling
 - Rutting
 - Patching
 - Bleeding
 - Ride Quality
- Additional Attributes observed:
 - Number of lanes
 - Block number
 - Segment length
 - Segment width
 - Sidewalk
 - Curb and gutter
 - Asphalt height above gutter
- Once data and field report are completed, report is generated which includes:
 - Pavement Condition Rating (PCR) Developed
 - Maintenance activities recommended for different types of distress and severity of distresses
 - Generate cost for all the needed maintenance
- Municipalities generally look at pavement as a cost due to the required maintenance; however, it should be considered an asset.

- Laurinburg's streets – 1,302,300 square yards
- Roadway assets - \$52.1 million

Mr. Wilson then reviewed the conditions with stresses and severity of streets in Laurinburg as shown on the table attached as Exhibit A. This chart also breaks the streets down by low volume traffic and high volume traffic.

Mr. Wilson then reviewed the Pavement Condition Report (PCR) with highlights below:

- PCR = 78.4
- NC Municipality Average = 80.0
- Street System is in "Fair" condition
- PCR is below average
- 56% of street system needs maintenance or resurfacing
- Laurinburg has a current need of \$5,367,500
- \$983,500 - Routine Maintenance
- \$4,384,000 – Resurfacing
- Additional Costs – 25% to 40%
 - Raising structures, milling, administrative, etc.

Mr. Wilson suggested that the City needs to look at proactive versus reactive maintenance in order to make some headway with improving the City streets. The primary suggested maintenance activities are shown on Attachment B. Mr. Wilson also suggested that the City get on a 15-year paving cycle and complete approximately six (6) miles per year, at a cost of approximately \$1.3 million per year.

Upon question by Mayor Willis, Mr. Wilson explained that staff was provided a book with all of the information from the PCR including a breakdown street by street with priorities.

Upon question by Councilmember Adams, Mr. Wilson explained that the PCR was 81% in 2016.

CONSIDER AMENDING CHAPTER 6 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF LAURINBURG BY ADDING ARTICLE VIII.-VACANT PROPERTIES IN LAURINBURG COMMERCIAL HISTORIC DISTRICT

The City Manager explained that since July, the prospect of an ordinance concerning vacant properties downtown had been discussed. Based on Council's recommendations, the City Attorney and Mrs. Mary Allison Yancey, Downtown Development Program Coordinator, have a proposed ordinance for Council to consider.

Mrs. Mary Allison Yancey, Downtown Development Program Coordinator, explained that one of the changes in the proposed ordinance from the ones of other municipalities that Council had reviewed was that instead of adding fees, any violation would be a civil penalty. She added that the priority will be to get the vacant buildings registered and a plan in place to get the buildings ready for occupancy.

The City Manager added that the goal was never to get to the civil penalty state. Staff wants to work with the property owners in order to get issues addressed.

Upon question by Councilmember Williamson, the City Manager explained that staff was comfortable with enforcing the ordinance but not enforcing the penalties.

Following further discussion, Councilmember Adams moved to approve Ordinance No. O-2022-29 amending Chapter 6 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Laurinburg by adding Article VIII.-Vacant Properties in Laurinburg Commercial Historic District. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Williamson, and the vote was as follows:

Ayes: Adams, Williamson, Rogers, Rainer, Evans

Nays:

(copy of Ordinance No. O-2022-29 on file in city clerk's office)

UPDATE ON SOCIAL DISTRICTS

Mrs. Mary Allison Yancey provided an update on research concerning the creation of social district in the downtown area. She added that she had copies of ordinances from other municipalities who had enacted the social district in their downtown areas. She discussed the economic development and possibilities of enacting a social district ordinance.

Mrs. Yancey reviewed the following possible regulations (some required):

- Non-reusable clear containers with logo of maximum of 16 ounces marked clearly with no smaller than 12 point font.
- Signs would say "Drink Responsibly" and "21 years old and Up".
- Establishments would be able to opt into or out of participating. There would be signage provided for those businesses that opt out.
- The Police Department would enforce the ordinance.

Following discussion, it was consensus of Council for staff to bring back on ordinance creating a social district in the downtown area.

CONSIDER AUTHORIZING MAYOR TO SEND LETTERS TO SENATORS BURR AND TILLIS REGARDING SOUTHEAST CRESCENT REGIONAL COMMISSION

The City Manager explained that Councilmember had requested that Council authorize the Mayor to send letters to Senator Richard Burr and Senator Thom Tillis requesting support for the Southeast Crescent Regional Commission (SERC), and for it to be based on the structure of the Appalachian Regional Commission. If the \$33 million budget for the SERC is approved, then the SERC would become active and would use the budget to help with infrastructure needs in the SERC.

Following discussion, motion was made by Councilmember Williamson, seconded by Councilmember Rainer, and unanimously carried to authorize the Mayor to send letters to

Senators Burr and Tillis regarding Southeast Crescent Regional Commission.

CONSIDER BUDGET AMENDMENT

The City Manager explained that the City was approved for a necessary increase in the loan amount from the Division of Water Infrastructure-Clean Water State Revolving Fund in the amount of \$2,549,000 for a total financing of \$10,315,000 to complete the renovation of the Influent Pump Station at the WWTP. The budget amendment is needed to amend the existing capital project for the WWTP Influent Pump Station to account for the increase in funding and construction expenditures.

Councilmember Adams moved to approve Ordinance No. O-2022-30 amending FY 2022-2023 Budget Appropriation Ordinance (Ordinance No. O-2022-21) by increasing revenues in the Water Sewer Capital Projects by \$2,549,000 to receive state revolving loan and increase expenditures in Water Sewer Fund Construction by \$2,549,000. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Evans, and the vote was as follows:

Ayes: Adams, Evans, Rainer, Rogers, Williamson

Nays: None

(copy of ordinance No. O-2022-30 on file in city clerk's office)

CONSIDER BUDGET AMENDMENT

The City Manager explained the City has been approved to pursue an option to demolish the Commonwealth Bridge with funding from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) administered through the NC Department of Transportation. The engineering for this project will be \$49,169.30 with the FHWA funding 80% of this expenditure. This budget amendment is needed to receive and expend the 80% match of \$39,335.00. The City's 20% match is already included in the FY 23 budget.

Councilmember Evans moved to approve Ordinance No. O-2022-31 amending FY 2022-2023 Budget Appropriations Ordinance (Ordinance No. O-2022-21) by increasing revenues in the General Fund to receive state grant in the amount of \$39,335 and increase Contracted Services by \$39,335. Councilmember Williamson seconded the motion, and the vote was as follows:

Ayes: Evans, Williamson, Rainer, Adams, Rogers,

Nays: None

(copy of Ordinance No. O-2022-31 on file in city clerk's office)

CLOSED SESSION

At 7:30 p.m., Councilmember Rainer moved to go into closed session to discuss prevent premature disclosure of an award. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Rogers, and carried unanimously.

At 7:36 p.m., Councilmember Williamson moved to adjourn the closed session and resume the regular meeting. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Rainer, and carried unanimously.

COMMENTS BY MAYOR AND/OR COUNCILMEMBERS

Councilmember Adams thanked Mayor Willis for his support and great enthusiasm he showed while discussing Laurinburg at the Economic Development Announcement earlier in the day.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion was made by Councilmember Williamson, seconded by Councilmember Rogers, and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting. The meeting adjourned at 7:37 p.m.

James T. Willis, Mayor

Jennifer A. Tippet, City Clerk