

**CITY OF LAURINBURG  
CITY COUNCIL MEETING  
JULY 19, 2016  
MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
303 WEST CHURCH ST.  
7:00 p.m.**

**Minutes**

The City Council of the City of Laurinburg held its regular meeting on Tuesday, July 19, 2016 in the Council Chambers of the Municipal Building at 7:00 p.m. with the Honorable Matthew Block, Mayor, presiding. The following Councilmembers were present: Mary Jo Adams, Dolores A. Hammond, Curtis B. Leak, Andrew G. Williamson, Jr. and J.D. Willis.

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

Mayor Block called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Councilmember Willis requested a moment of silence and he then led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Councilmember Willis explained that Council has chosen to have a moment of silence instead of a prayer at meetings due to lawsuits other governmental units have experienced.

Mayor Block requested that attendees turn cell phones off and that there be no talking.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Mayor Block asked that a discussion on a possible a corridor for solar farms be held before the public hearing on the solar farm request.

The City Attorney explained such a discussion could not be held during the public hearing on the request for a Conditional Use Permit for a solar farm which is a quasi-judicial hearing. He added that if there was going to be a legislative discussion about solar farms there would need to be a separate item on the agenda.

The City Manager explained that a closed session to consult with the attorney needed to be added to the agenda and also for Council to consider approval of a letter in support of St. Andrews University.

Motion was made by Councilmember Leak, seconded by Councilmember Williamson, and unanimously carried to approve the agenda as amended.

**PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD**

Mayor Block briefly reviewed the rules for the Public Comment Period and that this was not the

time to talk about the solar farm issue as this will be addressed during the public hearing. He explained that Council would not respond at the meeting, but would follow-up within 30 days.

Mr. Michael Edds, 1207 Blue Drive, expressed concern about Council having a Moment of Silence instead of an Invocation. He also expressed appreciation for the work on the Art Garden and encouraged Council to work together with the citizens on the proposed new City Hall using the same synergy used on the Art Garden. He discussed the child hunger rate, child abuse rate, lack of a homeless shelter, decay of downtown, crimes, unemployment and gang activity in the community, and the anger felt by people in the City. He explained that citizens were intimidated by Council because he expressed concern that he had expressed his opinion and was fired from a volunteer job for doing so. He added that his church, Crosspoint Church, was building a community center so that the City did not have to do so.

Mr. Jimmy Watts explained that he owns two (2) businesses, one (1) in the City and one (1) in the County. He expressed concern about the condition of Laurinburg, the lack of a recreation center, crime, gangs and drugs, high unemployment and lack of jobs.

Mr. Michael Schmidt, 444 South Main Street, explained that he was an attorney and was formerly a prosecutor in Scotland County. He expressed concern about crime and requested that Council increase the pay of police officers by 30%, and double or triple the police force instead of building a new City Hall in order to keep the citizens safe.

Mr. J.B. Haire expressed concern about children running the streets and the need for Council to listen to the citizens.

Mr. James Garby, 12900 Stratford Drive, presented a packet to Council containing results of an online and physical petition with over 2,378 names of individuals who are opposed to the proposed new City Hall and Police Station. (A copy of the packet is on file in the City Clerk's office.) He demanded that Council stop the proposed new City Hall and Police Station project.

Ms. Connie Barber expressed concern about the tax rate, the high unemployment rate and the proposed new City Hall and Police Station.

Ms. Kathy Durant, 15200 Cotton Drive, expressed concern about being annexed, not seeing law enforcement in her neighborhood, the proposed new City Hall and Police Station, and appreciation for Mayor Block.

Mr. Brian Gainey, 218 West Blvd., explained that he is opposed to the proposed new City Hall.

Ms. Laura Mosier, 501 Wikinson Drive, explained that she and her husband moved to Laurinburg a year ago, and Mayor Block is her new neighbor. She expressed concern about the condition of streets in the City and the condition of the downtown area. She suggested that Council reconsider spending \$11 million on a building.

Mr. Frank and Ms. Stacie Evans, 1449-B Terrace Drive, presented Council with comments from an on-line petition against the proposed new City Hall and Police Station. (A copy of the comments are on file in the City Clerk's office.)

Mr. Sean Craig, appeared expressed concern about his daughter being bullied at school.

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

Mayor Block presented the Consent Agenda as follows:

- a) Consider minutes of April 19, 2016 regular meeting
- b) Semi-Annual Surplus Property Report
- c) Consider Authorizing the City Manager to Execute Membership Agreement with NC 811, Inc.
- d) Consider Resolution No. R-2016-10 Amending Article VI. Employee Benefits, Section 10. Tuition Assistance Program

Councilmember Williamson moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Councilmember Adams seconded the motion, and it was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Williamson, Adams, Willis, Leak, Hammond

Nays: None

## **DISCUSSION ABOUT SOLAR FARM REGULATIONS**

The City Attorney explained that discussion had been held concerning location of solar farms on corridors in and out of the City. He added that currently, solar farms are allowed in the Residential-20 and Residential-20MH zoning districts with a Conditional Use Permit. He further added that with regard to solar farms, Council could have overlay districts, new zoning districts, add additional requirements or do nothing. He further explained that Planning Board should first consider any changes, and then Council would have a public hearing on the proposed changes.

Mayor Block explained that the location of solar farms on the City's main thoroughfares have generated controversy. He added that any changes to the City's regulations would not apply to the application for a solar farm already received by the City.

The City Attorney explained that even if Council made changes to the ordinance, the applicant can choose which regulations it wants to follow – the ones in existence at the time of filing the application or the new regulations. He discussed the changes in the City's solar farm regulations over the past several years. He added that most of the property that can be developed for solar farms is not located within the City limits or within the City's Extraterritorial Jurisdiction.

Councilmember Williamson explained that since Council has discussed solar farm regulation for some time, he would like staff to provide a visual of what property was currently available for potential solar farm development, and then Council could decide if the ordinance needed to be revised to consider thoroughfares.

Following further discussion, it was consensus of Council for staff to research solar farm regulations for Council to consider particularly as they are relative to the thoroughfares and to add this item to the August agenda.

**PUBLIC HEARING**

**CONSIDER CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT FOR A GROUND MOUNTED SOLAR ARRAY ON AN 89.17 ACRE TRACT OF LAND LOCATED ON US 15-401/501**

Mayor Block opened the public hearing.

Motion was made by Councilmember Hammond, seconded by Councilmember Willis, and unanimously carried to continue the public hearing until August 16, 2016.

**DELEGATION**

*Erin Rembert – Scotland County Arts Council*

Ms. Erin Rembert, Executive Director of the Scotland County Arts Council, explained that the requested funds of \$7,500.00 would be expended as follows:

\$1,500.00	Membership for the City, funds unrestricted, match grant money
\$1,500.00	Arts education, youth art camp, workshops, summer programs
\$1,500.00	Christmas on Main
\$1,500.00	Spring art show to promote the Art Garden

Motion was made by Councilmember Williamson and seconded by Councilmember Adams to allocate \$7,500.00 to the Scotland County Arts Council.

Councilmember Leak expressed concern that other non-profit organizations would request funding from the City.

Discussion ensued concerning partnership with the Scotland County Arts Council, the assistance it will provide to the City, the importance of arts, the importance of the Scotland County Arts Council in the downtown area, developing guidelines for funding non-profits, and the possibility of contracting with the Scotland County Arts Council for Christmas on Main and the spring art show.

Mayor Block requested a roll call vote, and the motion was approved by the following vote:

Ayes: Williamson, Adams, Hammond

Nays: Leak, Willis

**CITY MANAGER REPORTS**

**COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT UPDATE – MICHAEL MANDEVILLE**

Mr. Michael Mandeville, Community Development Director, provided an update on projects as follows:

- Finished the Art Garden.
- Obtained grant from ElectriCities to update website and working with vendor.
- In early stage of acceptance in the NC Main Street Program. Completed annual report of employment and businesses. Will be attending required meetings in Sanford and Sylva.
- Working on getting inmates to pick up trash.
- Discussing options for other uses of the Art Garden.
- Grant work includes the \$700,000.00 for infrastructure for the Industrial Park and \$94,000.00 for downtown.
- Constantly looking for new grant opportunities.
- Working with Lumber River Rural Planning Organization on pedestrian improvements for the City.

Upon question by Mayor Block, the City Manager explained that although the former Community Development Director attended some Scotland County Economic Development Corporation meetings, Mr. Mandeville was not attending as he was concentrating on the Downtown Associates Program working towards Laurinburg entering the Main Street Program.

### **CONSIDER RESOLUTION FOR DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE GRANT APPLICATION**

The City Manager explained that this resolution was for the Department of Commerce Industrial Development Fund Grant of \$708,000.00 to provide sewer for the City's property located between the Public Works facility and US Highway 74. He further explained that ElectriCities would assist the City in the Smart Sites Program to help the City market the property.

Councilmember Hammond moved to approve Resolution No. R-2016-11 Application For Department of Commerce Grant Application. Councilmember Adams seconded the motion, and the vote was as follows:

Ayes: Hammond, Adams, Willis, Williamson, Leak

Nays: None

(Resolution No. R-2016-11 on file in City Clerk's office)

### **POLICE DEPARTMENT UPDATE – CHIEF DARWIN WILLIAMS**

Police Chief Williams discussed the difficulties in the law enforcement profession and recent events across the country. He introduced several members of the Police Explorers as the future of law enforcement. Chief Williams discussed activities of the Police Department to work within the community including National Night Out, Shop With a Cop, softball tournament, golf tournament, toy drives, officers involved in coaching sports, serving on community boards, and many other activities. He explained that in 2015 the Police Department began having Community Cookouts in some of the higher crime neighborhoods in an effort to get to know the community and for the community to get to know the Police Department. He further explained

that the Police Department partnered with various ministers and churches in the community to help sponsor the cookouts.

Chief Williams explained that in response to recent events across the country, he contacted the President's Task Force on 21<sup>st</sup> Century Policing to discuss trends and what the Laurinburg Police Department has been doing to improve community relations.

Chief Williams stated that there are issues in the community, but Laurinburg is no different from anywhere in the United States.

Mayor Block thanked Chief Williams and the Police Department for their work.

*At 8:37 p.m., Mayor Block called for a break.*

*The meeting resumed at 8:42 p.m.*

### **CONSIDER SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL OPTIONS/PROPOSAL**

The City Manager explained that Council had been discussing municipal solid waste disposal options, and at the June 30, 2016 meeting, Council authorized staff to begin negotiating with Robeson County. He added that Mr. Harold Haywood, General Services Director, would provide an update.

Mr. Haywood explained that staff contacted Robeson County about the potential for the City to take its Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) to the Robeson County landfill. The "gate rate" for disposal at Robeson County is \$38.50/ton for MSW and \$24.50/ton for Yard Waste compared to the current rate the City is paying at Scotland County of \$55.75/ton for MSW and \$31.50/ton for Yard Waste. After discussions with Robeson County officials, the City may be offered a "discounted rate" of \$36.50/ton for MSW for guaranteeing a minimum annual tonnage of 10,000 tons, pending approval by the Robeson County Board of Commissioners. The City's average tonnage of MSW is currently 10,200 tons. In lieu of a guaranteed tonnage, the City would be allowed to dispose of its waste at Robeson County facilities at the established gate rate.

The City Manager explained that the options for consideration are to continue contracting with Scotland County for MSW and yard waste; to contract with Robeson County including yard waste for a net savings of \$158,000.00 annually, or to contract with Robeson County for MSW and find alternative for yard waste disposal which would result in approximately \$241,000.00 savings per year. He added that there is a possibility of the City disposing of yard waste at the City's property on Hall Street. He further added that the area would need to be two (2) acres or less, the material would have to be grinded, and State approval would be required.

Upon question by Councilmember Williamson, Mr. Haywood explained that there would be some additional costs involved if the City moved forward with the yard waste area on its property including capital and ongoing operational costs.

Upon question by Mayor Block, the City Manager explained that Scotland County had not

presented any other proposal.

Discussion ensued concerning the proposed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the City and Robeson County. Councilmember Hammond clarified that if the City entered into the MOU with Robeson County, the City could pull out with 60-days' notice and the City would be required to pay Robeson County the additional \$2.00 per ton for all tonnage taken to the Robeson County Landfill.

Discussion ensued concerning the possibility of meeting with Scotland County Board of Commissioners to further discuss MSW options in the future.

Following further discussion, motion was made by Councilmember Willis, seconded by Councilmember Leak, and unanimously carried to authorize the City Manager to execute the Memorandum of Understanding with Robeson County for one (1) year to allow the City to take its Municipal Solid Waste to the Robeson County Landfill.

### **DEBT AFFORDABILITY/CAPACITY AND FINANCIAL ANALYSIS PRESENTATION – DAVENPORT & COMPANY**

Mr. Ted Cole of Davenport & Company, explained that his firm had completed preliminary work with City staff to look at the City's existing Tax Supported Debt Profile and to analyze the City's Debt Capacity and Debt Affordability. He stressed that the analysis conducted looked only at tax supported debt and not at any of the utility funds' debt.

Highlights of his presentation are as follows:

#### *Existing Tax Supported Debt Profile*

- The City does not have a current rating by Moody's Investors Service, Standard and Poor's or Fitch Ratings – no Bond Rating since there has not been a need to have one.
- Municipalities with Bond Ratings in North Carolina are as follows:
  - Aaa – Cary, Chapel Hill, Charlotte, Durham, Greensboro, Huntersville, Raleigh and Winston-Salem
  - Aa – Apex, Asheville, Burlington, Carrboro, Clayton, Conover, Fayetteville, Fuquay-Varina, Garner, Gastonia, Goldsboro, Greenville, Hendersonville, High Point, Holly Springs, Indian Trail, Jacksonville, Lexington, Matthews, Mint Hill, Mooresville, Morrisville, Mount Holly, Sanford, Wake Forest, Weaverville, Wilmington, Wilson, Zebulon
  - A – Bessemer City, Dunn, Hamlet, River Bend, Salisbury, Stanley
- Outstanding debt as of FY 2015 Audit is a little over \$300,000.00, which is for a fire truck lease which will be repaid in 2022.
- Key debt ratio to review is the 10-Year Payout Ratio and all of Laurinburg's tax supported debt will be repaid by 2022. Most municipalities are in the 80-100% range, and in 2022, Laurinburg will be at 100%.
- Another key debt ratio is the Debt to Assessed Value and the City's ratio is at approximately .04%, which means very little tax supported debt outstanding. Laurinburg

compares very favorably with municipalities rated Aaa by Moody's. The City has capacity to take on additional debt and demonstrate that it is in good financial standing according to the ratios. This does not mean that debt is affordable.

- Another key ratio is Debt Service vs. Expenditures which measures how much of the City's annual budget goes to debt service payments. The City's current ratio is at 1.21% with annual payments of about \$76,000.00 out of a budget of a little over \$6 million in General Fund. On a comparative basis, the City is much lower than municipalities with strong bond ratings. Therefore, there is capacity to consider taking on additional tax supported debt.
- The City's tax supported debt declines and debt is paid off in 2022. Annually, beginning in FY 2017, annual payments for debt service step down by about \$33,000.00 so there is a small amount of dollars that could be reallocated to an additional project or anywhere else in the budget.
- Other potential revenue sources available for debt repayment include:
  - Electric Fund Interfund Loan Repayment to the General Fund - \$1,267,313.00 was transferred from the General Fund to the Electric Fund in the past several years and once the Electric Fund liquidity position is re-established, the repayment of this amount from the Electric Fund to the General Fund could be dedicated for future capital projects and debt service payments.
  - Reduction in E911 Personnel Costs-City entered into agreement with Scotland County to pay a portion of the County's E911 personnel costs through FY 2024. Beginning in FY 2020, the City payment will decrease, and the reduction in these costs could be used for future capital/debt service payments.
  - FY 2015 Operating Surplus – In FY 2015, the General Fund had an operating surplus of \$387,944.00. To the extent that the surplus is sustainable going forward, the City could consider dedicating all or a portion of this annual surplus for future capital projects/debt service beginning in FY 2017.

#### *Future Debt Capacity/Debt Affordability*

- Potential City Hall/Police Department project – Cost breakdown between the General Fund and Utility Funds would be determined based upon a reasonable allocation and will be reviewed by the Local Government Commission (LGC). For purposes of analysis, it was **assumed** that 67% of the debt service would be paid from the General Fund, and the remaining 33% of debt service from the City's three (3) Utility Funds.
- Financing Terms analyzed:
  - 15 Year Level Principal at 3.50%
  - 20 Year Level Principal at 4.50%
- Repayment Structures Analyzed:
  - Option 1: Decline in existing debt service and Electric Fund Interfund Loan Repayment
  - Option 2: Option 1 plus annual reduction in E911 personnel costs
  - Option 3: Option 2 plus \$150,000.00 annual operating surplus
  - Option 4: Option 2 plus \$300,000.00 annual operating surplus
- Summary of 15 Year Financing Capacity/Affordability Options:
  - Option 1:

- 10 Year Payout Ratio would be 64.10%
  - Debt to Assessed Value would be 0.24%
  - Debt Service to Expenditures would be 3.36%
  - Total Funding Capacity would be \$2,665,000.00
  - With General Fund Allocation of 67%, General Fund Allocation amount would be \$1,776,667.00
- Option 2:
  - 10 Year Payout Ratio would be 62.16%
  - Debt to Assessed Value would be 0.45%
  - Debt Service to Expenditures would be 5.90%
  - Total Funding Capacity would be \$5,320,000.00
  - With General Fund Allocation of 67%, General Fund Allocation amount would be \$3,546,667.00
- Option 3:
  - 10 Year Payout Ratio would be 61.41%
  - Debt to Assessed Value would be 0.69%
  - Debt Service to Expenditures would be 8.61%
  - Total Funding Capacity would be \$8,310,000.00
  - With General Fund Allocation of 67%, General Fund Allocation amount would be \$5,540,000.00
- Option 4:
  - 10 Year Payout Ratio would be 61.05%
  - Debt to Assessed Value would be 0.92%
  - Debt Service to Expenditures would be 11.11%
  - Total Funding Capacity would be \$11,235,000.00
  - With General Fund Allocation of 67%, General Fund Allocation amount would be \$7,490,000.00
- Summary of 20 Year Financing Capacity/Affordability Options would add number of years, reduce payment and increase amount of interest paid due to the extra five (5) years of financing.
  - Option 1:
    - 10 Year Payout Ratio would be 50.57%
    - Debt to Assessed Value would be 0.24%
    - Debt Service to Expenditures would be 3.21%
    - Total Funding Capacity would be \$2,695,000.00
    - With General Fund Allocation of 67%, General Fund Allocation amount would be \$1,796,667.00
  - Option 2:
    - 10 Year Payout Ratio would be 47.82%
    - Debt to Assessed Value would be 0.47%
    - Debt Service to Expenditures would be 5.84%
    - Total Funding Capacity would be \$5,625,000.00
    - With General Fund Allocation of 67%, General Fund Allocation amount would be \$3,750,000.00
  - Option 3:
    - 10 Year Payout Ratio would be 46.84%

- Debt to Assessed Value would be 0.72%
- Debt Service to Expenditures would be 8.53%
- Total Funding Capacity would be \$8,800,000.00
- With General Fund Allocation of 67%, General Fund Allocation amount would be \$5,866,667.00
- Option 4:
  - Ten Year Payout Ratio would be 46.37%
  - Debt to Assessed Value would be 0.97%
  - Debt Service to Expenditures would be 11.03%
  - Total Funding Capacity would be \$11,920,000.00
  - With General Fund Allocation of 67%, General Fund Allocation amount would be \$7,946,667.00

Mr. Cole discussed the debt ratios and cash flows under the four (4) options that could support additional debt should Council collectively decide to take on any financing, both with 15-year and 20-year financing. The charts below show the debt service, amount of General Fund Fund Balance used (Capital Reserve used) and the effect on the tax rate of \$.40 assuming no growth:

<b>15-Year</b>	Total Debt Service in General Fund	Capital Reserve Utilized	Tax Effect
<b>Option 1</b> (Interfund loan repayment only and payoff of existing debt in 2022)	\$2,650,343	(\$1,293,166)	\$0.00
<b>Option 2</b> (Option 1 plus annual reduction in E911 personnel costs)	\$6,710,114	(\$1,251,814)	\$0.00
<b>Option 3</b> (Options 1 and 2 plus \$150,000.00 annual operating surplus)	\$9,305,002	(\$1,505,358)	\$0.00
<b>Option 4</b> (Options 1, 2 and 3 plus \$300,000.00 annual operating surplus)	\$11,846,643	(\$1,759,856)	\$0.00

<b>20-Year</b>	Total Debt Service in General Fund	Capital Reserve Utilized	Tax Effect
<b>Option 1</b> (Interfund loan repayment only and payoff of existing debt in 2022)	\$3,043,518	(\$1,280,719)	\$0.00
<b>Option 2</b> (Option 1 plus annual reduction in E911 personnel costs)	\$7,718,778	(\$1,222,130)	\$0.00

<b>Option 3</b> (Options 1 and 2 plus \$150,000.00 annual operating surplus)	\$10,899,593	(\$1,458,620)	\$0.00
<b>Option 4</b> (Options 1, 2 and 3 plus \$300,000.00 annual operating surplus)	\$14,024,375	(\$1,696,229)	\$0.00

Mr. Cole explained that debt capacity is not an issue. He added the driver would be what potential revenues Council wanted to dedicate to a Capital Improvement Program.

Upon question by Mayor Block, Mr. Cole explained that in considering usage of capital reserves (General Fund Fund Balance) the unassigned funds in the Fund Balance were not considered since once Council makes a commitment to financing whatever project, money must be set aside and that money is no longer consider unassigned Fund Balance.

Upon question by Mayor Block, Mr. Cole explained that in making the assumption that the General Fund would finance 67% of any financing, it was assumed to be a good proxy. He added that the allocation is not a science, but the Local Government Commission (LGC) would require it to be reasonable. He further added that he looked at how costs have been allocated in the past among the General Fund and the three (3) utility funds.

After confirming with Mr. Cole that a debt service for \$11.8 million on a 15-year financing would be approximately an average of \$600,000.00 per year debt service, Mayor Block explained that if the proposed new building is not constructed, the \$600,000.00 could be used to lower City taxes by \$.09. He added that with the \$300,000.00 being used from the utility funds to service the debt, if the building was not built, utility rates could be reduced if the proposed building was not built.

Councilmember Leak cautioned that there are large capital expenditures expected in the future in the utility funds and that a reserve was also needed in the event of a crisis.

Mr. Cole clarified that he did not review the utility fund financials. He added that just like the General Fund needed to have reserves, so do the utility funds. He added that the LCG must approve any debt, and it will only allow a municipality to borrow what is needed for an approved project.

Upon question by Mayor Block, Mr. Cole explained that if the City borrowed \$11.8 million under a 15 year loan, there would still be capacity to borrow more money should the City need it. He added that it does not mean the City could afford it; the City would need to find additional revenues.

Upon question by Mayor Block, Mr. Cole explained that if the City borrowed \$11.8 million for the proposed new building and a few years later wanted to borrow \$3 million for a recreation center, that if the City had a multi-year capital program, he believed that the City would be able to borrow additional funds provided the revenue sources would provide the necessary revenue.

Discussion ensued concerning the \$800,000.00 that the Electric Fund borrowed from the General Fund. The City Manager explained that the Electric Fund had reached the point where there was no cash in the Fund and had to borrow funds from the General Fund. He added that this was a finding and concern from the LGC in the 2014 and 2015 audits.

### **CONSIDER REQUEST FROM ST. ANDREWS UNIVERSITY**

Councilmember Adams explained that Paul Baldasare, President of St. Andrews University, had requested a letter of support from the City for debt refinancing which will allow it to replace heating/air conditioning system in each building and begin renovation of dorms.

Motion was made by Councilmember Willis, seconded by Councilmember Adams, and unanimously carried to authorize the Mayor to write a letter of support for St. Andrews University.

### **MAYOR'S REPORT ON PARKS AND RECREATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Mayor Block explained that he had nothing to report as the Committee did not meet this month.

### **COMMENTS FROM MAYOR AND/OR COUNCILMEMBERS**

There were no comments from the Mayor or Councilmembers.

### **CLOSED SESSION**

At 9:50 p.m., Councilmember Adams moved to go into closed session pursuant to NC General Statute 143-318.11(a)(3) to consult with an attorney employed or retained by the public body in order to preserve the attorney/client privilege between the attorney and the City. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Williamson, and unanimously carried.

At 10:02 p.m., Councilmember Williamson moved to adjourn the closed session and resume the open meeting. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Adams, and carried unanimously.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Motion was made by Councilmember Willis, seconded by Councilmember Williamson, and unanimously carried to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 10:03 p.m.

---

Matthew Block, MD, Mayor

---

Jennifer A. Tippet, City Clerk