1. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

2. INVOCATION

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

5. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

6. CONSENT AGENDA
   A. Approval of Minutes of City Council Meeting with Citizens Academy Participants dated October 15, 2019 (Pages 3-4)
   B. Approval of City Council Meeting Minutes dated December 17, 2019 (Pages 5-11)
   C. Approval of City Council Meeting Minutes dated January 7, 2020 (Pages 12-16)
   D. Approval of City Council Meeting Minutes dated January 21, 2020 (Pages 17-24)

7. SPECIAL AGENDA
   Presentation of “Sanford NC – The Black Wall Street” Website (sanfordnctheblackwallstreet.com) by Carol Deese (Page 25)

8. CASES FOR PUBLIC HEARING

9. DECISIONS ON PUBLIC HEARINGS

10. REGULAR AGENDA
    Consider Municipal Agreement with Betterments for Transportation Improvement Project #R3830 – Broadway Widening (Pages 26-33)
11. NEW BUSINESS (Items for discussion and action will only be taken if necessary. Otherwise, these items will be placed on the next agenda for approval.

A. Consider Westfall Subdivision (now called “Autumnwood”) Preliminary Plat Renewal (Pages 34-44)

B. Consider Award of Design-Build Contract for Project Forge Water Line Extension and Access Road – Designer’s Fee (Pages 45-46)

C. Consider Offer from Calin Davidson to Purchase Vacant Lot at 1405 Boykin Avenue (Pages 47-51)
   - Consider Resolution Authorizing the Advertisement of an Offer to Purchase 1405 Boykin Avenue Having PIN 9642-64-6268, Sanford, North Carolina (Pages 52-53)

D. Consider Second Addendum to Commercial Lease Agreement with Progressive Development Company, LLC, County of Lee, and City of Sanford for Storage Rooms (Pages 54-55)

E. Consider Quarterly Budget Report – Second Quarter (through December 31, 2019) – (Page 56-68)

12. OTHER BUSINESS
   Closed Session (Page 69)

13. ADJOURNMENT
MINUTES OF MEETING WITH CITIZENS ACADEMY PARTICIPANTS
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 15, 2019, at 5:00 p.m., in the West End Conference Room, to receive feedback from Citizens Academy participants. The following people were present:

Mayor T. Chet Mann
Mayor Pro Tem Rebecca Wyhof Salmon
Council Member Sam Gaskins
Council Member Charles Taylor (arrived 5:20 pm)
City Manager Hal Hegwer
City Attorney Susan Patterson
City Clerk Bonnie Davis
Deputy City Clerk Vicki Cannady
Public Information Officer Kelly Miller

Absent:
Council Member Byron Buckels
Council Member Norman C. Post, III
Council Member Jimmy Haire
Council Member James Williams

Citizens Academy Participants Present:
Melissa Caddick
Christine Cline
Rosalinda Cruz
Christine Hilliard
Emily Mierisch
Allison Sills
Joseph Brad Simpson
Jennifer Soper
Lynn Ziobro

Absent:
Val Marcy
Stephanie Phillips
Tomitha Zimmerman

Mayor Mann opened the meeting by thanking those who participated in the 2019 Citizens Academy, which ran from July 8 through September 30, 2019. He requested feedback on the session from attendees and the following highlights were noted:

- Outdoor sessions were very interesting (specifically the Airport, Water Treatment Plant, Fire Department, Golf Course, Parks);
- Employees were very enthusiastic about their jobs, as evidenced by longevity and low staff turnover;
- Learning how various departments function will help them guide or answer questions from fellow citizens;
- They saw how plans are being made for smart growth.

Mayor Mann asked for suggestions on how we can continue to improve the program and suggestions were made for department heads to provide written summaries, along with contact information, and offering an advanced Citizens Academy course.

Mayor Mann noted that the program’s goal is to provide graduates with increased knowledge of local government. He encouraged them to share this knowledge with friends, family and neighbors and to apply for positions on local boards, commissions and committees. He reviewed the agenda for
the upcoming Council meeting and closed by thanking participants, staff and Public Information Officer Kelly Miller for organizing the session, and invited participants to stay for the meeting, where they would be recognized.

Respectfully Submitted,

__________________________________________
T. CHET MANN, MAYOR

Attest:

__________________________________________
BONNIE DAVIS, CITY CLERK
The City Council met at the Sanford Municipal Center, 225 E. Weatherspoon Street, on Tuesday, December 17, 2019, at 6 p.m., in Council Chambers. The following people were present:

Mayor T. Chet Mann
Mayor Pro Tem Byron Buckels
Council Member Jimmy Haire
Council Member Charles Taylor
City Manager Hal Hegwer
Deputy City Clerk Vicki Cannady
City Clerk Bonnie Davis
Council Member Rebecca Wyhof Salmon
Council Member Sam Gaskins
Council Member Norman Charles Post, III
Council Member James Williams
City Attorney Susan Patterson

CALL TO ORDER
Mayor Mann called the meeting to order. Mayor Pro Tem Buckels led the invocation. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

PUBLIC COMMENT
There were no requests for public comment.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA
Mayor Mann requested to add an item under New Business as Item 11A - Consider Audit Presentation on Financial Statement Ending June 30, 2019 and an item under Special Agenda as Item 7B – Consider Update from Sanford Area Growth Alliance (SAGA) and Chamber of Commerce. Council Member Taylor made the motion to approve the agenda as amended. Seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Buckels, the motion carried unanimously.

CONSENT AGENDA
Approval of Subordination of Deed of Trust for the Sanford Buggy Building, LLC – (Exhibit A)
Approval of Resolution Authorizing Conveyance of 16.78 Acres on Washington Avenue to Brick Capital Community Development Corporation – (Exhibit B)

Council Member Salmon made the motion to approve the consent agenda. Seconded by Council Member Gaskins, the motion carried unanimously.

SPECIAL AGENDA
Presentation of Proclamation Honoring Sanford Contractors 50th Anniversary – (Exhibit C)
Mayor Mann read and presented a proclamation to Donnie and Susan Oldham honoring Sanford Contractors’ 50th Anniversary. Sanford Contractors employs more than 300 workers and supports local high schools, Central Carolina Community College, the Christians United Outreach Center, the YMCA, The Salvation Army, the Lee County Education Foundation, the Boys & Girls Clubs of Central Carolina and many other nonprofit organizations, as well as a multitude of local youth sports teams.
Consider Update from Sanford Area Growth Alliance (SAGA) and Chamber of Commerce

Chamber of Commerce Executive Director for SAGA Meg Moss gave an update on various activities the Chamber offers and events it sponsors. She explained the Real Investment in Sanford Entrepreneurs (RISE) program; it is an entrepreneurship course designed to run for eight weeks and will teach people how to start and effectively run a business. This is being provided via a partnership between SAGA, Downtown Sanford Inc., and the Community College Small Business Center. A memorandum of understanding has been approved by the three entities and marketing materials are currently being developed and some have already been distributed via social media. There is a potential for a $5,000 reimbursable grant for rent and utilities for a business who opens in Downtown. The Downtown requirement is for a three-year pilot period. The business must also fall into a certain category such as food, beverage, or retail, to qualify for the grant and the potential grant recipient must show a solid business plan to a review committee that consist of local business owners. There are 22 individuals who have signed up for the program which will start on January 29, 2020. The class will be capped at twelve potential businesses.

World Broadband Connectivity is another area the Chamber has taken a collaborative leadership role. The Chamber Board of Directors recently sent a letter of thanks to Representative John Sauls for supporting the FIBER NC Act, which enables local leaders to build broadband infrastructure and partner with private internet service providers. They have a letter on standby to send to legislators urging them to support the Bill if needed.

SAGA CEO Mike Smith reminded everyone that SAGA was founded five years ago to better utilize the resources of the public and private sector. Over the past year, they have just finished something that we would see possibly as one of the most successful years of any North Carolina community our size in terms of new jobs and investment. When you look at the one-half billion-dollar investment announcement from Pfizer (300 jobs); the $170 million announcement with Bharat Forge (460 jobs) and Caterpillar announced an additional 100 jobs, the last six months has been phenomenal in terms of what SAGA is able to accomplish. It takes a lot of people to make these projects happen and he thanked Council, City Manager Hal Hegwer, Public Works Director Vic Czar, City Engineer Paul Weeks, City Attorney Susan Patterson, Director of Financial Services Beth Kelly and Community Development Director Marshall Downey for their help in making this a successful year. In October, they partnered with Triangle Business Journal to share all the good news happening in Sanford and is a marketing tool for Sanford. They were a partner in the World North Carolina event that Council helped to sponsor held in October where the hotels were full and a festive night held at Hugger Mugger. They have worked with partners at WRAL.com to build our brand and continue to reach the triangle area and our message of opportunity in Sanford and Lee County.

Mr. Smith stated that our community is becoming a center of global excellence in the gene therapy research area. He added that the Central Carolina Enterprise Park along with the Shell building has contributed to several companies locating in Sanford. He praised Bob Joyce for his expertise, experience, and contacts for helping land the Bharat Forge project.

CASES FOR PUBLIC HEARING
Consider Public Hearing on Petition for Non-Contiguous Annexation Under G. S. 160A-58.1
(Property Owned by Lee County - 1905 Colon Road) – (Exhibit D)
Senior Long-Range Planner II David Montgomery explained that the City received a petition from Lee County on October 24, 2019 for non-contiguous annexation. The annexation meets five criteria as required by the North Carolina General Statutes. If the property is annexed, the City has 60 days to assign a City-designated zoning district. See report attached as Exhibit D for details.

Mayor Mann opened the public hearing. No one spoke in favor or in opposition. With no one requesting to speak, the public hearing was closed.

- Consider Ordinance to Extend the Corporate Limits of the City of Sanford, North Carolina – (Exhibit E)
  Council Member Salmon made the motion to adopt the Ordinance to Extend the Corporate Limits of the City of Sanford. Seconded by Council Member Gaskins, the motion carried unanimously.

Consider Public Hearing on Petition for Contiguous Annexation Under G. S. 160A-31 (Versie and Johnathan Brady – Brady Road & Amos Bridges Road) – (Exhibit F)
Mr. Montgomery explained that this petition for contiguous annexation was received on July 31, 2019 and received a survey map for annexation of 1.136 plus or minus acres located at the corner of Amos Bridges Road and Brady Road. The Bradys wish to connect to City sewer and thus request annexation. See Report listed as Exhibit E for details.

Mayor Mann opened the public hearing. No one spoke in favor or in opposition; Mayor Mann closed the public hearing.

- Consider Ordinance to Extend the Corporate Limits of the City of Sanford, North Carolina – (Exhibit G)
  Council Member Gaskins made the motion to adopt the Ordinance to Extend the Corporate Limits of the City of Sanford, North Carolina. Seconded by Council Member Taylor, the motion carried unanimously.

**CASES FOR PUBLIC HEARING: to be held jointly with the Planning Board:**
Consider Application by Lee County to rezone 1.3 + acres, being a portion of a 21.3-acre tract addressed as 1905 Colon Road, from Residential Agricultural (RA) to Heavy Industrial (HI). The subject property is identified as a portion of Tax Parcel 9655-30-3668-00 as depicted on Lee County Tax Map 9655.03. – (Exhibit H)

This rezoning request is conditional upon the subject property being annexed into the corporate City limits, for which a public hearing/vote by the Sanford City Council will also be held tonight. The intent of the annexation and follow-up rezoning is that the site be developed in an industrial manner.

Zoning Administrator Amy McNeill explained that this property was just annexed into the City limits tonight and now Council needs to assign a zoning district to it. It is currently zoned Residential Agricultural and Lee County has submitted a request to rezone it to Heavy Industrial so that it can be used as an access drive to the Project Forge site. Staff recommends approving the rezoning request.
Mayor Mann opened the public hearing. With no one requesting to speak in favor or in opposition, the public hearing was closed.

Consider Application by Johnathan Mark Brady, for property owned by the Versie S. Brady Life Estate, to rezone 1.1+ acres comprised of three tracts of land developed with a single-family dwelling addressed as 217 Amos Bridges Road from Residential Restricted (RR) to Residential Restricted (RR). The subject property is identified as Tax Parcels 9644-67-4061-00, 9644-66-3981-00, and 9664-66-2964-00 as depicted on Lee County Tax Map 9642.12 and illustrated on a 2019 recombination plat labeled Property of/Recombination for Johnathan Mark Brady recorded at Plat Cabinet 2019, Slide 76 of the Lee County Register of Deeds Office. – (Exhibit I)

Zoning Administrator Amy McNeill explained that this property was just annexed into the City limits tonight. It is currently zoned Residential Restricted and the property owner has no intention of redeveloping the property at this time. It has one single-family dwelling on it; they would like to connect to public City sanitary sewer; therefore, the request is to remain zoned Residential Restricted. Staff recommends keeping the zoning of Residential Restricted at this location.

Mayor Mann opened the public hearing. With no one requesting to speak in favor or in opposition, the public hearing was closed.

The Planning Board retired to the West End Conference Room.

REGULAR AGENDA
Consider Banking Services Contract – (Exhibit J)

Financial Services Director Beth Kelly explained that the City invited all local banks to bid on the City’s banking services contract. The current contract is with First Citizens Bank and expires February 28, 2020. The new contract period will be for March 1, 2020 through February 28, 2024, with an option for an additional year. Five banks responded to the request. After analyzing the bids, staff recommends the City award its banking services contract to First Citizens Bank, based primarily on the fixed rate price offered and the ability to offer all of the services as requested. It should be noted that First Citizens actually bid the exact same price that we have been paying for the last five years in the amount of $3,827 per month. There will be no additional budget requested for the next fiscal year.

Mayor Pro Tem Buckels made the motion to award the banking services contract to First Citizens Bank. Seconded by Council Member Gaskins, the motion carried unanimously.

NEW BUSINESS
Consider Audit Presentation on Financial Statement Ending June 30, 2019 – (Exhibit K)

Financial Services Director Beth Kelly introduced Keith Joyce, partner with Joyce and Company, CPA. Mr. Joyce presented a presentation (Exhibit K) on the City’s General Fund, Utility Fund and Fund Balance and an audit was performed on the Tourism Development Authority. The increase in the Utilities Fund-Budget Basis expenditures was due to the issuance of bonds. There were no problems performing the audit and they were given the information as
City Council Meeting  
December 17, 2019

requested; staff was very helpful. Mrs. Kelly informed Council that she reviewed the TDA ‘s audit with the members of the Sanford Tourism Authority today and that the CAFR will be placed on line tomorrow for the public.

Consider Grant Project Ordinance Amendment – North Carolina Housing Finance Agency 2018 Urgent Repair Program (URP1828) – (Exhibit L)  
Community Development Manager Karen Kennedy explained that we need to allocate the interest that has been accumulated for the funds that were sent to the City when we first received the Urgent Repair Project. One of the requirements of that is you have to place the grant monies in an interest-bearing account and track that information. We turn in quarterly information about the interest every time we send in a report. Because we are at the end of the project and we have two more houses we would like to get complete, staff would like to allocate this interest to the project. We hope to expend this interest on one of the houses at the end of the project. This project ends in February 2020.

Council Member Taylor made the motion to adopt the Grant Project Ordinance Amendment; seconded by Council Member Gaskins, the motion carried unanimously.

Consider Entering into an Economic Development Agreement with NCDOT Regarding Project Forge Offsite Roadway – (Exhibit M)  
City Engineer Paul Weeks explained that this is an economic development agreement between the City of Sanford and the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT). The NCDOT will provide $964,600 for the construction and engineering for the access roadway to Project Forge site and also potential improvements to Colon Road to help us access the Project Forge site. There is a revised agreement at Council’s seat for two minor revisions to the agreement. The DOT had to add a few minor words to the contract and check to make sure this would allow the City to design-build as a method of procurement. Staff believes the road cost is estimated at $965,000 but until staff gets the design work and bid, we will not know the final cost. The DOT will supply up to the $965,600 even if the cost is less than the $1.3 million in the agreement. Council Member Gaskins made the motion to approve the agreement. Seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Buckels, the motion carried unanimously.

Consider Interlocal Agreement with Lee County for Debris Removal in the Event of a Natural Disaster – (Exhibit N)  
Facilities/Beautification Administrator Kris Furmage explained that the agreement is with Lee County for debris removal in the event of a natural disaster. Lee County has entered into a contract with Ceres Environmental Services, Inc. for disaster debris management in the event of a natural disaster and the City of Sanford has an option to participate in that contract. The contract is for three years with the option to renew up to two additional one-year periods. As you know when a disaster occurs, it is in the public’s best interest to provide expedient management of storm debris for the health and safety of our citizens since we may not have the manpower and resources to handle debris management. Staff recommends entering into this agreement with Lee County who has secured the services of an experienced disaster debris management contractor who can assist us in such cases that these services are needed. The County would be responsible for paying the contractor for the services provided and the County would also seek reimbursement from FEMA (75%) and the State (25%). Any work done for the City that is not reimbursed, the City
would be responsible for paying Lee County for services that FEMA and the State does not reimburse the County. Public Works Director Vic Czar stated that this is FEMA driven to streamline your reimbursement in the event of a natural disaster declaration. It is the closest thing to a guarantee that you would get your money back that you expended on your debris removal. FEMA reimburses 75 percent if declared a disaster and it is up to the State to pay the remaining 25 percent. Typically, they do but it is a budget constraint that they may or may not.

Mayor Pro Tem Buckels made the motion to approve the interlocal agreement with Lee County. Seconded by Council Member Taylor, the motion carried unanimously.

Consider Resolution to Temporarily Close a Portion of Westover Drive for the Purpose of 5K Fundraiser Sponsored by Rogue Alpha Athletics – (Exhibit O)

Transportation Administrator Phil Lawrence explained that the resolution is for the second annual 5K fundraiser event to benefit the Central Carolina Community College Athletics Department sponsored by Rogue Alpha Athletics. The road closure would be on January 11, 2020, between the hours of 9 AM until 11:30 A.M. and would temporarily close Westover Drive from 1716 Westover Drive proceeding north to the dead-end of the street and back.

Council Member Gaskins made the motion to adopt the resolution. Council Member Taylor seconded the motion and the motion carried unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS

Council Member Taylor gave an update on the Opioid Commission meeting on Wednesday, December 11. He congratulated the Lee Senior Football team and complimented on how many residents attended the game from Sanford. He stated that it was estimated at 4,000 people who attended the Winter Wonderland event at the Fairgrounds last night; it was a fundraiser for the CUOC.

Mayor Mann congratulated the Lee County High School Football Team and will be reading a proclamation on Thursday night. He thanked the Sheriff’s Department, Police Department and the Highway Patrol who escorted the team to the county line. The Lee County Commissioners had the consensus last night to place the multi-sports complex on the ballot for the citizens to decide. He attended the ribbon cutting for the MINA School last week in Kendale and a lot will be happening due to the construction of the school. Representative John Sauls came by today and thanked Council for appropriating money to pave Evergreen Street. Mayor Mann noted that we have had great success with S3 Connect and the Bread of Life Ministry which serves our emergency shelter. He stated there is a great board and great S3 task force and Bread of Life Ministry but they need to bolster those boards with some business people with some financial and accounting type backgrounds to help reinforce what the committee is doing. So much progress has been made and he does not want to see us back up now. He asked Council and the public that if they know someone that would be led to use their talents with their business background to serve on the S3 Connect and potentially serve on the Bread of Life Ministry, they would be grateful. Anyone interested should contact him or Karen Kennedy. They have made huge strides to make homelessness a rare, brief, and non-recurring and to answer a need when individuals have no place to go during the cold weather and heat of the summer. If you have the talent, treasury and resources to give, to please consider volunteering and join the two boards.
CLOSED SESSION

Council Member Gaskins made a motion to be made to go into closed session in accordance with N.C.G.S. 143-318.11(a)(5) to establish or to instruct the public body’s staff or negotiating agents concerning the position to be taken by or on behalf of the public body in negotiating the price and other material terms of a contract or proposed contract for the acquisition of real property. Seconded by Council Member Salmon, the motion carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

Council Member Post made the motion to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Buckels, the motion carried unanimously.

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

Respectfully Submitted,

______________________________
T. CHET MANN, MAYOR

ATTEST:

______________________________
BONNIE DAVIS, CITY CLERK
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, January 7, 2020, at 6 p.m., in Council Chambers. The following people were present:

Mayor T. Chet Mann
Council Member Sam Gaskins
Council Member Charles Taylor
City Manager Hal Hegwer
City Clerk Bonnie Davis

Mayor Pro Tem Byron Buckels
Council Member Jimmy Haire
Council Member James Williams
City Attorney Susan Patterson

Absent:
Council Member Rebecca Wyhof Salmon
Council Member Norman Charles Post, III
Deputy City Clerk Vicki Cannady

CALL TO ORDER
Mayor Mann called the meeting to order. Council Member Charles Taylor led the invocation. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

PUBLIC COMMENT
There were no requests for public comment.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA
Mayor Pro Tem Buckels made the motion to approve the agenda. Seconded by Council Member Gaskins, the motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA
City Council Meeting Minutes dated December 3, 2019
Mayor Pro Tem Buckels, made the motion to approve the agenda. Seconded by Council Member Gaskins, the motion carried unanimously.

SPECIAL AGENDA
There were no items on the special agenda.

CASE FOR PUBLIC HEARING
Public Hearing on an Economic Development Project – Project Jupiter (Exhibit A)
Sanford Area Growth Alliance Economic Development Executive Director Bob Joyce explained that Project Jupiter is a life science company. They have proposed to invest $126 million and create 196 jobs at an average wage of $88,903. If we are successful in attracting this company, they anticipate purchasing and upfitting the Shell Building. The company first visited in May 2019, as a result of Mike Smith’s conversation with a member of the North Carolina Bio Tech Agency at Site Selectors Guild in March. They subsequently went to California and visited this company and were made aware of our Spec building. We recently received a lot of support from the Bio Tech Center and the Economic Development Partnership. The project was reviewed with Council in closed session in June 2019, at which time SAGA made an initial incentive offer to the company. We were named one of the finalist sites in July, and SAGA met with Council again in late July and revised our incentive offer to make it
more competitive. This is still a competitive project with other states. The SAGA Executive Committee and Economic Development Committee highly recommend this project and the local incentive investment. They also recommend this performance-based agreement which is very competitive and also protects the taxpayer’s investment. If the company selects Sanford, the resulting investment would have an economic impact similar to the Bharat Forge project. Both companies would have an annual payroll of approximately $17 million. In addition, a recent study showed attracting high wage jobs, such as this life-science company, would have a ripple effect in all job categories; for every 10 high-tech jobs either in STEM-related or digital fields, there are six local jobs created in the service local industry. If approved, SAGA will present this offer to the company and the company has informed SAGA that if we are successful, the company will make a decision early sometime this month.

Mayor Mann opened the public hearing. Mr. Taylor asked for clarification that SAGA is looking a 7-year period for real property as opposed to the traditional five years for incentives. Mr. Joyce replied yes; they felt we needed to offer this company the additional years as this investment is a little unusual in that there is more investment in real estate than there is in business personal property; extending it would be good to attract this company. With no one requesting to speak in favor or in opposition, the public hearing was closed.

City Attorney Susan Patterson asked that Council include in its motion to authorize staff to update the agreement with the name of the company once it has been revealed at the appropriate time.

- **Agreement Regarding Incentive Funds by and Between the City of Sanford, North Carolina and Project Jupiter (Exhibit B)**
  Council Member Williams made a motion to approve the Agreement Regarding Incentive Funds by and Between the City of Sanford, North Carolina and Project Jupiter and authorize staff to update the agreement with the appropriate name of the company once it is revealed at the appropriate time. Seconded by Council Member Gaskins, the motion carried four to one in favor with Council Member Taylor casting the dissenting vote.

SAGA Chief Executive Director Mike Smith explained the educational degrees that some employees will need for the life-science company. Dr. Chapman, President of Central Carolina Community College, was one of the key components in aiding to bring these life science companies to Sanford. He also added that there are over 7,000 exiting military personnel every year and there is an opportunity to bring them to Sanford to work at this potential location. Mr. Smith explained that with Pfizer’s expansion and if we are able to get this life science company, it is a great opportunity to bring other companies to Sanford.

Mayor Mann stated that in the *Triangle Business Journal*, with Pfizer’s expansion, it has put the RTP (which Sanford is now included in) in the top five life-science hubs in the world.

**DECISIONS ON PUBLIC HEARINGS**

Application by Lee County to rezone 1.3 + acres, being a portion of a 21.3-acre tract addressed as 1905 Colon Road from Residential Agricultural (RA) to Heavy Industrial (HI). The subject property is identified as a portion of Tax Parcel 9655-30-3668-00 as depicted on Lee County Tax Map 9655.03 (Exhibit C)

Community Development Director Marshall Downey explained that a public hearing was held on December 17. It is an application from Lee County for 1.3 acres, being a portion of a 21.3-acre tract at 1905 Colon Road. The Planning Board recommends that the City Council support the petition by Lee
County to rezone the subject property as requested. While the request for Heavy Industrial (HI) zoning does not conform with the recommendation of the long-range plan designation of Suburban Neighborhood, the adjoining 98 acre+/- tract was land was recently rezoned to Heavy Industrial (HI) and at that time, it was stated that this property would be proposed for annexation and rezoning in the near future to serve as an access to the larger adjoining industrial site. There is a reasonable expectation that this property would also be allowed to be used for industrial purposes.

- Vote to Approve a Statement on Long Range Plan Consistency as it Relates to this Rezoning Request
  Council Member Gaskins stated that the request for Heavy Industrial (HI) zoning does not conform with the recommendation of the long-range plan designation of Suburban Neighborhood; therefore, he made the motion that the request is not consistent with the adopted comprehensive plan. It should be noted, however, that the adjoining tract of land was recently rezoned to Heavy Industrial (HI) with the intention of being redeveloped as Bharat Forge and the subject property was proposed to serve as access to that site at that time. The motion was seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Buckels and it carried unanimously.

- Consider Vote to Approve or Deny the Rezoning Request – Consider Adoption of Ordinance Amending the Official Zoning Map of the City of Sanford, North Carolina (Exhibit D)
  Mayor Pro Tem Buckels made the motion that the proposed zoning map amendment is reasonable and in the public interest because, even though the request for Heavy Industrial (HI) zoning does not conform with the recommendation of the long-range plan designation of Suburban Neighborhood, the adjoining 98 acre+/- tract of land was recently rezoned to Heavy Industrial (HI) and at that time, it was stated that this property would be proposed for annexation and rezoning in the near future to serve as an access to the larger adjoining industrial site. As such, there is a reasonable expectation that this property would be allowed to be used for industrial purposes. He moved to approve the request to rezone one 1.3+/- acres of land off of Colon Road from Residential Agricultural (RA) to Heavy Industrial (HI). The motion was seconded by Council Member Gaskins and it carried unanimously.

Application by Johnathan Mark Brady for property owned by the Versie S. Brady Life Estate to rezone 1.1+ acres comprised of three tracts of land developed with a single-family dwelling addressed as 217 Amos Bridges Road from Residential Restricted (RR) to Residential Restricted (RR). The subject property is identified as Tax Parcels 9644-67-4061-00, 9644-66-3981-00, and 9664-66-2964-00 as depicted on Lee County Tax Map 9642.12 and illustrated on a 2019 recombination plat labeled Property of/Recombination for Johnathan Mark Brady recorded at Plat Cabinet 2019, Slide 76 of the Lee County Register of Deeds Office (Exhibit E)

  Community Development Director Marshall Downey explained that a public hearing was held on December 17 with the Planning Board. Mr. Brady wanted access to public sewer so he is requesting to rezone from Lee County Residential Restricted (RR) to a City Residential Restricted (RR). The Planning Board finds that keeping the current Residential Restricted (RR) zoning appears to be appropriate given that the location does not lend itself to facilitating development of a large scale integrated mix of uses and it is visible from a major arterial roadway (UD Hwy1/15-501), but is not accessible from this roadway. Mr. Downey clarified a misleading comment in the staff report and stated that for the record - mobile homes are not allowed in the Residential zoning.

- Vote to Approve a Statement on Long Range Plan Consistency as it Relates to this Rezoning Request
  Council Member Gaskins stated the request for Residential Restricted (RR) zoning does not conform with the recommendation of the long-range plan designation of Mixed-Use Activity Area; therefore,
he made the motion that the request is not consistent with the adopted comprehensive plan. However, it should be noted that the request appears to be appropriate given that the location does not lend itself to facilitating development of a large-scale integrated mix of uses and it is visible from a major arterial roadway (US Hwy 1/15-501), but is not accessible from this roadway. The motion was seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Buckels, and it carried unanimously.

- Consider Vote to Approve or Deny the Rezoning Request – Consider Adoption of Ordinance Amending the Official Zoning Map of the City of Sanford, North Carolina (Exhibit F)

Mayor Pro Tem Buckels made the motion that the proposed zoning map amendment is reasonable and in the public interest because, even though the request for Residential Restricted (RR) zoning does not conform with the recommendation of the long-range plan designation of Mixed-Use Activity Area, the request appears to be appropriate given that the location does not lend itself to facilitating development of a large scale integrated mix of use and it is visible from a major arterial roadway (US Hwy 1/15-501), but is not accessible from this roadway. Therefore, he made the motion to approve the request to maintain the current zoning of Residential Restricted (RR) for three tracts of land developed with a single-family dwelling addressed as 217 Amos Bridges Road. The motion was seconded by Council Member Gaskins and it carried unanimously.

**REGULAR AGENDA**

There were no items on the regular agenda.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Ordinance Amending the Annual Operating Budget of the City of Sanford FY 2019-2020 – Utility Fund Administration (Exhibit G)**

Financial Services Director Beth Kelly explained that this amendment transfers $25,000 from Contingency in the Utility Fund to Utility Fund Administration for consulting system development fees and water/wastewater financial planning.

Council Member Gaskins made a motion to approve the Ordinance Amending the Annual Operating Budget of the City of Sanford FY 2019-2020 – Utility Fund Administration. Seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Buckels, the motion carried unanimously.

**Ordinance Amending the Annual Operating Budget of the City of Sanford FY 2019-2020 – Planning/HPC (Exhibit H)**

Community Development Director Downey explained that the amendment appropriates $5,805 from insurance proceeds to the Planning/HPC Department for one of the City’s wayfinding signs that was destroyed at the intersection of Cole Street and Horner Boulevard. Once the appropriation has been made for the funds, the City will replace the sign, which will take about four to five weeks.

Council Member Gaskins made a motion to approve the Ordinance Amending the Annual Operating Budget of the City of Sanford FY 2019-2020 – Planning/HPC. Seconded by Council Member Taylor, the motion carried unanimously.

**Ordinance Amending the Annual Operating Budget of the City of Sanford FY 2019-2020 – Code Enforcement (Exhibit I)**

Community Development Director Marshall Downey explained that this amendment appropriates $4,751 from insurance proceeds for a Ford Fusion – a code enforcement vehicle that was involved in an accident. These funds will be used to repair the wrecked vehicle.
Council Member Taylor made a motion to approve the Ordinance Amending the Annual Operating Budget of the City of Sanford FY 2019-2020 – Code Enforcement. Seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Buckels, the motion carried unanimously.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

Council Member Taylor stated we all need to be cognizant of the recent deployment of our troops, which will leave a lot of spouses and families behind.

Mr. Taylor and Mr. Buckels expressed Happy New Year to staff and the public.

Mr. Hegwer stated that he and two council members rode out to the Bharat Forge site and witnessed some of the excavation taking place and if any other council member would like to visit the site, to let him know.

Mayor Mann asked Council Members to mark your calendars for the February retreat and to bring their best ideas. He would like for staff to update the goals from last year. Having the retreat offsite allows minimal distractions.

Mayor Mann wished everyone a Happy New Year.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Council Member Gaskins made the motion to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Council Member Williams, the motion carried unanimously.

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

Respectfully Submitted,

______________________________
T. CHET MANN, MAYOR

ATTEST:

______________________________
BONNIE DAVIS, CITY CLERK
The City Council met at the Sanford Municipal Center, 225 E. Weatherspoon Street, on Tuesday, January 21, 2020, at 6 p.m., in Council Chambers. The following people were present:

Mayor Pro Tem Byron Buckels  
Council Member Sam Gaskins  
Council Member Rebecca Wyhof Salmon  
Council Member Charles Taylor  
City Attorney Susan Patterson  
City Manager Hal Hegwer

Council Member James Williams  
Council Member Jimmy Haire  
Council Member Norman Charles Post, III  
Deputy City Clerk Vicki Cannady  
City Clerk Bonnie Davis

Absent:  
Mayor T. Chet Mann

CALL TO ORDER  
Mayor Pro Tem Buckels called the meeting to order. A moment of silence was held in memory of Mayor Chet Mann’s grandmother, Sarah Mann. Sarah Mann was the wife of former mayor and Council Member Tommy Mann, Sr. Mayor Pro Tem Buckels delivered the invocation.

Scouts BSA Troop 942G performed a flag ceremony and led everyone in the Pledge of Allegiance under the leadership of Scoutmasters Shannon Macon and Allison Fulcher.

PUBLIC COMMENT  
Gabby Murillo, residing at 546 Lanier Farm Road, asked that Council approve her continued service on the Sanford Housing Authority (SHA). She has served on the SHA for a little over two years and she moved outside of the City limits. Ms. Murillo stated that the SHA serves people outside of the County including Harnett County. She felt allowing people in the county to serve on the SHA would help to have fair and equal representation. SHA is going through a RAD transformation and have a lot of important work that is being done now. Ms. Murillo asked that Council allow her to keep her seat on the SHA and allow people who live in the county to serve on the Authority.

Paul Lewis and Hannah Brooks, representing Scouts BSA Troop 942G, spoke regarding the activities of Troop 942G and added that they are working on their merit badge.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA  
Council Member Gaskins made the motion to approve the agenda. Seconded by Council Member Salmon, the motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA  
Approval of City Council Work Session Meeting Minutes dated September 10, 2019 – (Minute Book 98)

Approval of City Council Meeting Minutes dated September 17, 2019 – (Minute Book 99)

Approval of City Council Meeting Minutes dated October 1, 2019 – (Minute Book 99)
Approval of City Council Work Session Meeting Minutes dated October 8, 2019 – (Minute Book 99)

Approval of City Council Work Session Meeting Minutes dated November 12, 2019 – (Minute Book 100)

Approval of City Council Meeting Minutes dated November 19, 2019 – (Minute Book 100)

Approval of City Council Work Session Meeting Minutes dated December 10, 2019 – (Minute Book 100)

Approval of Capital Project Ordinance Amendment – Moncure Megasite Wastewater Project No. S1703 – (Exhibit A)

Approval of Grant Project Ordinance Amendment – Sanford/Lee County Regional Airport Sewer Extension Project No. S1801 – (Exhibit B)

Approval of Engineering Services Agreement for Little Buffalo Sanitary Sewer Replacement with WithersRavenel – (Exhibit C)

Council Member Gaskins, made the motion to approve the consent agenda. Seconded by Council Member Salmon, the motion carried unanimously.

CASE FOR PUBLIC HEARING
Consider Municipal Service District Expenditures – (Exhibit D)

Mayor Pro Tem Byron Buckels opened the public hearing. Financial Services Director Beth Kelly explained the Municipal Service District Expenditures as listed on Exhibit D. With no one requesting to speak in favor or in opposition, the public hearing was closed.

- Approval of Municipal Service District Expenditures
  Council Member Gaskins made the motion to approve the expenditures. Seconded by Council Member Post, the motion carried unanimously.

REGULAR AGENDA
Approval of Memorandum of Agreement – Project Safe Neighborhoods – (Exhibit E)

City Manager Hal Hegwer stated that extensive discussion has been held regarding the agreement. It is an agreement between the City of Sanford, County of Lee, the District Attorney’s office and the North Carolina Administrative Office of the Courts for Project Safe Neighborhood (PSN). The agreement sets up, through the Administrative Office of the Courts-the District Attorney’s Office, to hire a District Attorney Legal Assistant (part-time position). This position has technically worked initially through the Sanford Police Department since 2014 in the Detective Division. The request is from the U. S. Attorney’s Office to move the position out of the Sanford Police Department to the District Attorney’s office. The salary is $20 per hour for twenty hours per week. The total expense for the position would be about $41,722, with the City paying $13,814. This agreement is also being presented before the County tonight. Some of the initial training for this position, for the entire Middle District, has been put off and we are trying to move forward with this position.
Council Member Taylor made the motion to approve the agreement. Council Member Gaskins seconded the motion. The motion passed in favor with a vote of six to one with Council Member Post casting the dissenting vote.

**Approval of Ordinance Amending the Annual Operating Budget FY 2019-2020 — Project Safe Neighborhoods — (Exhibit F)**

City Manager Hal Hegwer explained that this ordinance appropriates $13,814 to the Sanford Police Department for the City’s share of the Project Safe Neighborhood Program. Council Member Gaskins made the motion to adopt the ordinance. Seconded by Council Member Taylor, the motion passed with a vote of six to one in favor with Council Member Post casting the dissenting vote.

**NEW BUSINESS**

**Consider Ordinance Amending the Annual Operating Budget FY 2019-2020 — Golf Course (Exhibit G)**

City Manager Hegwer explained that this ordinance appropriates $10,000 to replace a piece of equipment (about 15 to 17 years old) that maintains bunkers and greens (Sandpro) at the golf course. Council Member Gaskins made the motion to adopt the ordinance. Seconded by Council Member Post, the motion carried unanimously.

**Consider Approval of Lease with Bharat Forge Aluminum — (Exhibit H)**

City Attorney Susan Patterson explained that when we entered into an economic development incentive agreement with Bharat Forge, the County also entered into an agreement. In the County’s agreement, there was a provision that when they transfer the land to the company, that they would agree to give the City a lease so that the City could finish the site improvements on the property that we committed to in our incentive agreement. This is a lease that memorializes that transaction so that they would lease the 78.+/-. acres property for the location of the industry to the City for the sum of $1 for the time period necessary for the City to prepare and complete the site improvements on that property. The City agrees to provide those improvements to the site. If they have to get a mortgage, or borrow some money to put a lien against the property, our lease will come second to that. We would agree to subordinate, so they can get their financing in place to carry on their improvement for the Forge facility. This agreement will last until site improvements have been completed. The instrument is in the hands of Bharat Forge’s attorney to look at it. It should not be negotiated any further but there may be some slight changes that are necessary to it; if there is anything material, staff will come back to Council.

Council Member Gaskins made the motion to approve the lease with any slight adjustments/modifications that might be necessary as needed. Council Member Salmon seconded the motion.

Council Member Taylor requested clarification as to what constitutes minor changes and at what point is Council notified of the changes. Attorney Patterson replied that if there are any material changes, such as if they want to put stipulations on any of the site improvements we would be improving, or create any additional obligations or rights not before Council.

The motion passed unanimously.

**Consider Approval of Construction Contract Award Recommendation - Project Forge Sewer Extension — (Exhibit I)**

City Engineer Paul Weeks explained that this is a recommendation to award the contract for Project Forge sewer extension. There were four bidders and the low bidder was Sandhills Contractors
in the amount of $1,701,435. We have worked with Sandhills Contractors and staff recommends awarding the project to Sandhills Contractors. This money is budgeted. Since this project is funded by CDBG funds, Council will have to tentatively award this bid. CDBG requires this language because funds have not been released by CDBG and we cannot start until the funds are released. We expect them to be released around mid-March. He referred to a map (Exhibit J) showing the Project Forge sewer line extension. Mr. Gaskins asked if there is a decimal point error on Alternate one, Item 10, from North American Pipeline Management. Mr. Weeks explained that North American Pipeline Management made some sort of clerical error in their bid submittal so the answer is yes, probably. Mr. Gaskins noted that North American Pipeline Management was not the low bidder.

- Consider Resolution of Tentative Bid Award for Gravity Sewer for Project Forge – (Exhibit K)
  City Engineer Paul Weeks explained that because CDBG is funding this project in the amount of $1.25 million and Infrastructure Development Funds in the amount of $500,000 (totaling $1.75 million), we have to execute a resolution for the tentative bid award for this project. It is not your typical construction project where you just award it. This resolution allows us to start the contract documents and get them in order and ready to go, so once the City receives the funds, we can get the contractor to begin.

  Council Member Salmon made the motion to approve the tentative bid award to Sandhills Contractors. Seconded by Council Member Gaskins, the motion carried unanimously.

Consider Discussion Regarding Appointments to the Sanford Housing Authority (Exhibit L)

  City Attorney Susan Patterson explained that the Sanford Housing Authority has two vacancies due to a resignation of a member and a member moving outside the city limits. There are two applications from individuals who are interested in the position. The city clerk has advertised for applicants in the newspaper for tomorrow. The City has requirements to serve on different boards and committees; one of which is a requirement that you be registered to vote in the city limits. If you move outside the city limits, you no longer have the ability to be registered to vote in the city. There is a request by the applicant, who held the position that moved, that Council consider waiving the requirement of residency. If Council wants to consider these positions, it is up for Council’s decision.

  Mr. Taylor asked when the next meeting is for the Sanford Housing? Mr. Buckels replied the fourth Monday of each month. Mr. Taylor asked if an applicant moves outside the City limits, do they have to submit a resignation prior to moving. Attorney replied that it is typical that someone resigns, when they move outside the city limits. However, by law, if you are no longer eligible your office it is defacto vacant, so they lose it by virtue of having moved; they vacated the office. Mr. Taylor noted that he had no problem with the candidates; both could serve very well. However, he had concerns regarding appointments, and other commissions down the road and what city code issues versus county code issues. This SHA was increased by two members, prior to the new director being hired, so the authority increased from five to seven members. He felt by increasing the number of board members on the SHA, it made having a quorum more difficult.

  Mr. Taylor noted that if the SHA can get through their next meeting, he would like for discussion to be held on this matter at the next workshop. Mr. Taylor asked when the member moves outside the city, does it nullify any action the board may have taken during that time? Attorney Patterson replied quite possibly; when they move, they lose their eligibility, but she stated that question was best left to be answered by the SHA’s attorney.
Mr. Gaskins asked when does Ms. Murillo’s term ends? Attorney Patterson replied June 30, 2021. Mr. Buckels noted that when the number increased to seven members, it has been difficult to get good, quality people to serve on the SHA. Mr. Peace is an individual who is dedicated to this community, has a degree in Business Administration and for these reasons, he would like for Council to consider Mr. Peace’s application. He lives in the ETJ area and these two positions do expire June 30, 2021. Mayor Pro Tem Buckels suggesting keeping Ms. Murillo on the Authority until June 30, 2021 and to add Mr. Peace until June 30, 2021 just for this case and hold discussion on it later.

Council Member Post stated that pursuant to the Code of Ordinances, Section 2-191(c) because of the need for flexibility in this case, he moved that we waive the residency requirement for these two appointments that we are about to either approve or not approve tonight for this case and this case only. Council Member Williams seconded the motion.

Council Member Haire stated that when we put this request out and with affordable housing in the news every day it looks like more than two people would be interested in applying. He asked if we do an adequate job of getting the word out – when the meeting is and how often. Mr. Hegwer stated that it is advertised and it could be a lack of interest. City Clerk Bonnie Davis stated that it has been advertised in the newspaper, television station, website, social media, etc.

Council Member Gaskins stated that he disagrees with making both appointments at the same time. It clearly states case-by-case basis. This is two different cases. If we are going to waive the city ordinance, we need to have a good reason and not being able to fill a position, in general, he did not feel it is a good reason. People with whom we fill these vacancies, if we are going to waive one of our laws, we need to have something unique or rare. In the case of Ms. Murillo, she has been on the board for two years and moved out of the city limits but still lives in Lee County; that would be an unusual situation and has showed that she has something to offer to the board. He agrees with Mr. Taylor; if we are going to waive the rule because we need people on the board, it is a terrible precedent to set. Mayor Pro Tem Buckels said it is not to waive the requirement to fill a spot, but to waive the rule to have good people who qualify. Mr. Gaskins stated that he has told some outstanding individuals they cannot serve who lives in the County that asked about applying on the ADA but we have other people in the city limits who are qualified. We need to have a good reason to waive the law.

Mr. Post stated that he agrees that if you waive the requirement, we need a good reason. Ms. Murillo and Mr. Peace are good applicants. Mr. Peace has a degree in Business Management and he was the head manager of an apartment building in his prior career; so, he has managed domiciles where people live and that is what the Sanford Housing Authority does. Even though Mr. Peace does not live in the city limits; he lives in the ETJ. For those reasons, he felt we should the waive the residency requirement for Mr. Peace and Ms. Murillo.

Attorney Susan Patterson clarified that Mr. Post’s motion was to waive the residency requirement under the Section C of the ordinance; she did not hear him say we need to appoint anyone. A motion would need to be made to waive the residency requirement and appoint one person to one spot or two people to two spots but otherwise, the only issue in front of Council is to waive the requirement.

Mr. Post stated that was his intention, so he made the motion to waive the residency requirement for both of them and vote on each one of the applicants individually. Mr. Post restated his motion that pursuant to the City of Sanford’s Code of Ordinances, Section 2 – 191 (c) because of the need for more
flexibility, he made the motion to waive the residency requirement for the case of Gabby Murillo and in the case of Reginald Peace, Jr., for further vote tonight.

City Attorney Patterson stated that the motion would not be appointing them at this time, just waiving the requirement so they can be appointed. Council Member Williams seconded Mr. Post’s motion.

Mr. Taylor asked Attorney Patterson if a precedent has been set in this room before. Attorney Patterson replied we have not waived the residency requirement to her knowledge except for the Tourism Development Authority and Opioid Commission by virtue of position. We have waived someone serving more than two terms on a board.

Mr. Taylor stated that we agree we have two great candidates and how we get there is the hardest part. He said if the exception is waived, does it protect the integrity of the votes of the individual that was not in good standing on that board. She would defer that to the Sanford Housing Authority; she would not want to comment on whether their action was in line or out of line. The Sanford Housing Authority’s counsel would need to do that. We could possibly lower the number of individuals on the Authority to five applicants. His predicament tonight is not the candidates or worthiness of the candidates, because both candidates work hard in the community, but he has a problem of opening Pandora’s box and setting a precedent that could cause Council grief down the road as we protect the integrity of our City boards and who serves on the boards. He does not have the answer. Mr. Taylor stated that due to where we are at, he would like to see it tabled to a workshop in two weeks. He wants Council to act on this matter and is willing to move forward with the two candidates; however, he would like to see better detail on how we get to that point and not open it up for down the road for a few boards. Council Member Gaskins seconded the motion. Council Member Taylor noted that he would like for discussion to be taken before a vote is taken on the matter. Attorney Patterson clarified Mr. Taylor’s motion to table. She asked if it is tabling until the next board meeting with the workshop to be allowed for discussion and Mr. Taylor added not to exceed the next voting meeting. Mr. Hegwer stated that we have a Council meeting before we hold our next workshop. Mr. Taylor clarified to hold the matter at the next workshop for discussion and then place it on the next Council meeting after the workshop for a vote. Mr. Gaskins stated that he hopes part of the discussion will include separating these two and having the full reasons why we would be waiving this rule in each individual case so that as Mr. Taylor mention, we want to protect ourselves down the road.

Mr. Post stated that he is not trying to open up Pandora’s box; however, this code of ordinance would not allow for modifications if it was not something you could do. The code allows us to waive it on a case-by-case basis; we need flexibility.

A vote was taken on Council Member Taylor’s motion to table and seconded by Council Member Gaskins, and it failed with a three to four vote. Council Members Taylor, Gaskins, and Haire voted in favor to table and Council Members Williams, Salmon, Post and Mayor Pro Tem Buckels cast the dissenting votes.

A vote was taken on Council Member Post’s original motion and seconded by Council Member Williams in favor of waiving the residency requirement for these two applicants this time only. The motion passed in favor with a five to two vote with Council Members Williams, Haire Salmon, Post and Mayor Pro Tem Buckels voting in favor. Council Members Taylor and Gaskins cast the dissenting votes.
Council Member Salmon nominated Gabby Murillo. Council Member Post nominated Reginald Peace, Jr. Council Member Post moved to close the nominations. Council Member Salmon seconded the motion and it carried unanimously.

Council Member Salmon made the motion to appoint Gabby Murillo to the term on the SHA to expire June 30, 2021; the motion was seconded by Council Member Post. The vote passed in favor to appoint Gabby Murillo with a vote of six to one with Council Member Taylor casting the dissenting vote.

Council Member Post motion to appoint Reginald Peace, Jr. to the term on SHA to expire June 30, 2021 and was seconded by Council Member Williams. The vote was five to two in favor to appoint Reginald Peace with Council Members Taylor and Gaskins casting the dissenting votes.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

Council Members expressed their condolences and prayers for the Mann family in the passing of Mayor Chet Mann’s grandmother, Sarah Mann.

Council Member Taylor stated that before Council has given reports from the various boards and commissions and we need to look at some safety mechanisms to put in place when people move to protect the integrity of our votes in the meetings. He mentioned that he saw Pitt County received funding for a re-entry commission. This program was talked about with a liaison from the School of Government in Chapel Hill. They identify resources as to how to get people when they come into re-entry and their environment. He would like the city manager and assistant to explore that program to look at what we can possibly do to participate in that program and if it might help with Project Safe Neighborhood.

Mayor Pro Tem Buckels thanked everyone who showed their support to celebrate the life and legacy of Martin Luther King Jr. Dr. King stood for justice and served as a wonderful example of leadership for all people. The Police Department did an awesome job with assisting with the traffic at the event. He announced there will be an all boards meeting on Thursday, January 23, 2020, at 6 PM, at the McSwain Center on Tramway Road.

**Closed Session**

City Attorney Susan Patterson read the motion to go into closed session in accordance with North Carolina General Statute 143.318.11(a) (1) to prevent the disclosure of information this is privileged or confidential or not considered a public record (4) to discuss matters relating to the location or expansion of industries or other businesses in the area; and (5) to establish or to instruct the public body’s staff or negotiating agents concerning the position to be taken on behalf of the public body in negotiating the price or material terms of a contract or proposed contract for the acquisition of real property. So moved by Council Member Salmon and seconded by Council Member Gaskins, the motion carried unanimously.
ADJOURNMENT

Council Member Norman Charles Post III made the motion to adjourn the meeting; seconded by Council Member Taylor, the motion carried unanimously.

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

Respectfully Submitted,

______________________________

T. CHET MANN, MAYOR

ATTEST:

______________________________

BONNIE DAVIS, CITY CLERK
PRESENTATION OF
SANFORD NC – THE BLACK WALL STREET
NORTH CAROLINA

TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROJECT – MUNICIPAL AGREEMENT WITH BETTERMENTS

LEE COUNTY

DATE: 1/22/2020

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

TIP #: R-3830

AND

WBS Elements: 38887.3.2

CITY OF SANFORD

NOW, THEREFORE, the parties hereto, each in consideration of the promises and undertakings of the other as herein provided, do hereby covenant and agree, each with the other, as follows:
SCOPE OF THE PROJECT

1. The Project consists of widening NC 42/SR 1579 (Sanford Road) from US 421 to SR 1538 (East Harrington Avenue). At the request of the Municipality, construction will include pedestrian facilities and sidewalks within the municipal limits.

2. In accordance with the Department’s Pedestrian Policies and Complete Streets Guidelines, the Department shall include provisions in its construction contract for pedestrian facilities on or along the north side of NC 42 from South Horner Blvd to Thornwood Drive and on the south side of NC 42 from South Horner Blvd to Rosser Road, including sidewalks and bike lanes, within the municipal limits. Said work shall be performed in accordance with the Department’s policies, procedures, standards, and specifications, and the provisions herein.

PLANNING AND DESIGN

3. The Department shall prepare the environmental and/or planning document, and obtain any environmental permits needed to construct the Project, and prepare the Project plans and specifications needed to construct the Project. All work shall be done in accordance with departmental standards, specifications, policies and procedures.

RIGHT OF WAY

4. The Department shall be responsible for acquiring any needed right of way required for the Project. Acquisition of right of way shall be accomplished in accordance with the policies and procedures set forth in the North Carolina Right of Way Manual.

5. It is understood by both parties that all work for the betterments shall be performed within the existing right of way. However, should it become necessary, the Municipality, at no expense or liability whatsoever to the Department, shall provide any needed right of way and or construction easements for the construction of the betterments, and remove from said rights of way all obstructions and encroachments of any kind or character. Acquisition of any needed right of way shall be performed in accordance with the following state and federal policies and procedures, “Right of Way Acquisition Policy and Land Acquisition Policy, contained in the Federal-Aid Policy Guide, Part 712, Subpart B”, and the North Carolina Right of Way Manual (Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970). The Department shall be indemnified and held harmless from any and all damages and claims for damages associated with the acquisition of any construction easements and/or right of way.
UTILITIES

RESPONSIBILITIES

6. The Municipality shall be responsible for the relocation and adjustment of all municipally-owned utilities in conflict with the Project and shall exercise any rights that it may have under any franchise to effect all necessary changes, adjustments, and relocations of communications and electric power lines; underground cables, gas lines, and, and other pipelines or conduits; or any privately- or publicly-owned utilities. Said work shall be performed in a manner satisfactory to the Department prior to the Department beginning construction of the Project.

UTILITY RELOCATION BY DEPARTMENT

7. If the Municipality requests the Department to include the relocation and/or adjustment of municipally owned utilities in its construction contract provisions, and the Department agrees, then a separate utility agreement will be prepared to state the cost estimate and the reimbursement terms. The Municipality shall reimburse the Department all or a portion of the costs associated with said relocation, in accordance with NCGS 136-27.1. Reimbursement will be based on final project plans and actual costs of relocation.

CONSTRUCTION

8. The Department shall construct, or cause to be constructed, the Project in accordance with the plans and specifications of said Project as filed with, and approved by, the Department. The Department shall administer the construction contract for said Project.

COSTS AND FUNDING

9. The Municipality shall participate in the Betterment costs of the Project as follows:

   A. **Sidewalks**: The Municipality shall pay for 30% of the actual cost of the work, including administrative costs, associated with the construction of the sidewalk within the corporate limits. The estimated cost to the Municipality is $112,500. The Department shall participate in 70% of the actual cost of the pedestrian facilities up to $262,500. Total estimated costs are $375,000. Both parties understand that these are estimated costs subject to change. *(See Attachment 1)*

   B. **Bike lanes**: The Municipality shall reimburse the Department 100% of the actual cost, including administrative costs, of the work associated with the construction of 1' of the bike lanes within the corporate limits where bike lanes will be installed. The estimated
total cost is $195,716. Both parties understand that these are estimated costs subject to change. (See Attachment 2)

10. Upon completion of the Project, the Department will invoice the Municipality for their portion of the actual costs of the sidewalk. The reimbursement to the Department from the Municipality shall be made in one final payment within sixty days of invoicing. A late payment penalty and interest shall be charged on any unpaid balance due in accordance with NCGS § 147-86.23.

11. In the event the Municipality fails for any reason to pay the Department in accordance with the provisions for payment herein above provided, NCGS § 136-41.3 authorizes the Department to withhold so much of the Municipality’s share of funds allocated to said Municipality by NCGS § 136-41.1 until such time as the Department has received payment in full under the reimbursement terms set forth in this Agreement.

MAINTENANCE

12. Upon completion of the Project, the road improvement(s) shall be a part of the State Highway System and owned and maintained by the Department.

13. The Municipality, at no expense to the Department, shall assume all maintenance responsibilities for the sidewalks and release the Department from all liability relating to such maintenance.

ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS

14. It is the policy of the Department not to enter into any agreement with another party that has been debarred by any government agency (Federal or State). The Municipality certifies, by signature of this agreement, that neither it nor its agents or contractors are presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible or voluntarily excluded from participation in this transaction by any Federal or State Department or Agency.

15. To the extent authorized by state and federal claims statutes, each party shall be responsible for its respective actions under the terms of this agreement and save harmless the other party from any claims arising as a result of such actions.

16. The other party to this Agreement shall comply with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title 49 CFR, Subtitle A, Part 21) and related nondiscrimination authorities. Title VI and related authorities prohibit discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, disability, gender, and age in all programs or activities of any recipient of Federal assistance.

17. All terms of this Agreement are subject to available departmental funding and fiscal constraints.
18. This Agreement contains the entire agreement between the parties and there are no understandings or agreements, verbal or otherwise, regarding this Agreement except as expressly set forth herein.

19. The parties hereby acknowledge that the individual executing the Agreement on their behalf is authorized to execute this Agreement on their behalf and to bind the respective entities to the terms contained herein and that he has read this Agreement, conferred with his attorney, and fully understands its contents.

20. A copy or facsimile copy of the signature of any party shall be deemed an original with each fully executed copy of the Agreement as binding as an original, and the parties agree that this Agreement can be executed in counterparts, as duplicate originals, with facsimile signatures sufficient to evidence an agreement to be bound by the terms of the Agreement.

21. By Executive Order 24, issued by Governor Perdue, and N.C. G.S.§ 133-32, it is unlawful for any vendor or contractor (i.e. architect, bidder, contractor, construction manager, design professional, engineer, landlord, offeror, seller, subcontractor, supplier, or vendor), to make gifts or to give favors to any State employee of the Governor’s Cabinet Agencies (i.e., Administration, Commerce, Environmental Quality, Health and Human Services, Information Technology, Military and Veterans Affairs, Natural and Cultural Resources, Public Safety, Revenue, Transportation, and the Office of the Governor).

IT IS UNDERSTOOD AND AGREED upon that the approval of the Project by the Department is subject to the conditions of this Agreement.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this Agreement has been executed, in duplicate, the day and year heretofore set out, on the part of the Department and the Municipality by authority duly given.

L.S. ATTEST: CITY OF SANFORD

BY: ________________________________ BY: ________________________________

TITLE: ________________________________ TITLE: ________________________________

DATE: ________________________________ DATE: ________________________________

N.C.G.S. § 133-32 and Executive Order 24 prohibit the offer to, or acceptance by, any State Employee of any gift from anyone with a contract with the State, or from any person seeking to do business with the State. By execution of any response in this procurement, you attest, for your entire organization and its employees or agents, that you are not aware that any such gift has been offered, accepted, or promised by any employees of your organization.

This Agreement has been pre-audited in the manner required by the Local Government Budget and Fiscal Control Act.

(SEAL) (FINANCE OFFICER)

Federal Tax Identification Number

Remittance Address:
City of Sanford

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

BY: ________________________________

(CHIEF ENGINEER)

DATE: ________________________________

PRESENTED TO THE BOARD OF TRANSPORTATION ITEM O: ________________________________
Memo
To: April Annis
Project Management Unit - Project Manager
From: Karen Lovering, PE
Preliminary Estimates Engineer
Subject: Construction Cost Estimate for Sidewalk Cost Share on TIP Project R-3830 for the City of Sanford in Lee County

City of Sanford
(Sidewalk Cost Share)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Sidewalk</td>
<td>7,850</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>$40.00</td>
<td>$314,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization (5.0%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td></td>
<td>$15,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$329,700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.&amp;C. Cost (10% State Funded)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$45,300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction Cost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$375,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC-DOT Participation</td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$262,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sanford</td>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td>$112,500.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Estimate is for Preliminary Use Only. Quantities and Unit Prices are subject to change.
Memo To: April Annis  
Project Manager – Divisions 5 & 8

From: Forrest Dungan, PE  
Preliminary Estimate Engineer

Subject: Preliminary Construction Cost Estimate for urban improvements on TIP Project R-3830 in the City of Sanford

City of Sanford  
(Bike Lane Betterments)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASPHALT CONC BASE COURSE, TYPE B25.0C</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>43,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASPHALT CONC INTERMEDIATE COURSE, TYPE I19.0C</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>$55.00</td>
<td>39,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASPHALT CONC SURFACE COURSE, TYPE S9.5C</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>$55.00</td>
<td>29,150.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASPHALT BINDER FOR PLANT MIX</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>575.00</td>
<td>57,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization (5 %)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>$8473.00</td>
<td>8,473.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>177,923.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. &amp; C. Cost (10%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17,793.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>195,716.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Estimate is for Preliminary Use Only. Quantities and Unit Prices are subject to change.
CITY OF SANFORD CITY COUNCIL
PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATION
February 4, 2020

Consideration of Preliminary Plat Renewal for Westfall Subdivision
(name revised to Autumnwood Subdivision)

Planning Board Recommendation: The Sanford Planning Board considered this item at their January 21, 2020 meeting and, after thoughtful discussion and deliberation, recommended that the City Council approve the request to renew the preliminary plat with the design as originally approved in 2006 by a unanimous vote. This recommendation includes the condition that the that the second entrance/exit roadway for fire/emergency services that connects to Valley Road (as illustrated on a “Boundary Survey for Autumnwood Subdivision” recorded in Plat Cabinet 2015, Slide 8 of the Lee County Register of Deeds Office) be maintained per the codes & policies of the Sanford Fire Department prior to the final plat for the next phase being recorded. This was due to the Sanford Fire Department expressing concern during the TRC review that the existing emergency services access/fire access not being properly maintained and requesting that this roadway be brought into compliance and properly maintained prior to the final plat for the next phase being recorded. It was noted that, since the second entrance/exit roadway for fire/emergency services is proposed to be included in the area of the next phase, the roadway will be constructed as a City maintained public street, which should satisfy this condition. This recommendation also includes the general language included within the staff report which states that all outstanding Sanford/Lee County TRC review comments and revisions must be addressed prior to the final plat(s) being recorded.

There was discussion regarding the staff recommendation that Redwood Drive be extended to the westernmost perimeter property line to serve as a “stub” street for possible future development on the adjoining tract of land. After considering the existing development & acreage of the adjoining tract of land and the growth in the area, the board concluded that having the Autumnwood Subdivision remain separate and buffered from the adjoining residents by the vegetation typically found in residential back yards was favorable to having a public street being constructed and “stubbed” to an adjoining property owner’s back yard. Also, there was a consensus that the plat was originally approved in 2006 without this “stub” street and should remain as is.

Introduction: Mr. Albert C. Adcock is requesting renewal of the Westfall Subdivision preliminary plat (since renamed for marketing as Autumnwood Subdivision). This plat was originally approved in 2006 with a two-year extension granted in 2009. Phase 1 was recorded in 2010 and several lots have been sold and houses built. Now, in 2020, the property owner would like to move forward with recording the remaining phases of the subdivision; therefore, he is asking to renew the preliminary plat. If approved, the plat would be valid for two years (the maximum allowed per the UDO), with two years allowed between the recordation date of each phase. The design has not changed and the TRC was amenable to this plat moving forward.

Location: Off of Cool Springs Road (SR 1325), a NCDOT maintained public street
Property Owner: Albert C. Adcock
Project Developer: Undetermined, the subject property is being marketed at this time
Project Engineer: Ken Bright Associates, PLLC
Township: West Sanford
Ward: City Council Ward 2
Tax Parcel: 9634-11-5000-00
Tax Maps: 9643.03
Zoning: Residential Single-family (R-20)
Total Lots: 245 total, with 69 lots legally created in Phase 1 = 176 lots in remaining phases
Acreage: 199.95 acres total with 146 acres remaining outside of Phase 1
Minimum Lot Size: 20,000sf
Smallest Lot Size: 20,000sf or 0.46 of an acre
Average Lot Size: 22,744 or .52 of an acre
Linear Feet of Street: 13,300 + linear feet total
Street: Public Streets with a 50ft right-of-way width, City of Sanford
Water & Sewer: Public Water & Sewer, City of Sanford
Fire District: City Station #3, per GIS

Area & Site Description: The subject property is one vacant tract of land located in the northeastern corner of Cool Springs Road and Valley Road within the corporate City limits.

Zoning District Information
Current Zoning
The minimum lot width is 100ft, with a minimum lot size of 20,000sf, and a max building height of 40ft.
The minimum building setbacks for a principal structure or house is as follows:
Front: 30 feet, as measured from the right-of-way line of the proposed public street
Rear: 30 feet, measured from the rear property line
Side(s): 15 feet, measured from the side property lines

Adjoining Zoning
North: Residential Restricted (RR) in Lee County
South: Residential Single-family (R-20), opposite Cool Springs Road in the City of Sanford
East: Residential Restricted (RR) and Residential Single-family (R-14) in the City of Sanford
West: Residential Restricted (RR), opposite Valley Road and in Lee County

Area Plans and Overlay Districts
Long Range Plan: The Plan SanLee land use plan identifies the future land use place type for this tract of land as “suburban neighborhood”, which has the following characteristics:
- Residential areas on the outskirts of a core urbanized area
- Facilitates large scale development of single-family residential
- Walkable, with high degree of transportation connectivity between neighborhoods
- Local example: Westlake Valley neighborhood in Sanford

Land use designations include forests, undeveloped open space, schools, churches, neighborhood parks, as well as detached and attached single-family dwellings. Forms of transportation include automobiles (vehicular connectivity is encouraged in new development) that share the roads with pedestrian uses like sidewalks, off-street trails, transit and commercial area connections. Also included in transportation is on-street bike lanes and off trail bicycle systems, and public transit. The current zoning districts are residential single-family (R-20, R-14, R-12SF, and R-12). The maximum development density is four to seven units per acre with moderate building setbacks and a 35ft height limit. Utility infrastructure is public water and public wastewater. The preferred character is interconnected curvilinear streets, 600ft block lengths, curb & gutter with sidewalks, and street trees.

Local Overlay District Notes: Per GIS, the subject property is not located within a historic district or a Watershed Conservation Overlay District. There is Flood Hazard Area/Floodplain that bisects the site in a north/south manner, which is illustrated on the plat and will need to be taken into consideration when/if the site is developed.
Utilities: The overall site has access to public water along Cool Springs Road and Valley Road and the developer will extend the water main lines within the site to serve the proposed additional phases of the subdivision. Public sanitary sewer was extended from the north to serve Phase 1 and will be extended throughout the additional phases of the subdivision. All public water and sewer extensions must be reviewed and approved by the City of Sanford Engineering/Public Works Department.

Staff Analysis: No architectural plans are required to be reviewed/approved as part of this subdivision review since the zoning is a standard R-20 district and not a conditional zoning district. Also, no sidewalks or curb & gutter are required since the lots are 20,000sf or greater.

The topography slopes downward from the exterior roadways bounding the perimeter of the overall site towards the center of the site along the floodplain/creek. Sanford/Lee County does not have a local grading permit and relies on the North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality (NCDEQ) to regulate land disturbing activities. A sedimentation and erosion control plan for this project must be approved by NCDEQ and a copy of the approval must be on file with the Planning Department prior to recordation of the final subdivision plat.

Staff recommends that if the preliminary plat is renewed, that Redwood Drive be extended to the perimeter property line to serve as a ‘stub’ street for possible future development on the adjoining tract of land. Also, the Sanford Fire Department has expressed concern regarding the existing emergency services access/fire access, is not being properly maintained and asks that this roadway be brought into compliance and properly maintained prior to the final plat for the next phase being recorded.

Other Conditions/ Requirements/Notes:
1.) The TRC reviewed the revised design on December 19, 2019 and was agreeable with the preliminary plat moving forward for review & approval by the Planning Board and the City Council. All TRC technical revisions must be addressed prior to the final plat being recorded.
2.) A copy of the NCDEQ approval will be required prior to recordation of the final plat for each phase.
3.) A copy of the NCDOT approval will be required prior to recordation of the final plat for each phase.
4.) The preliminary plat shall be valid for two years is approved by the Sanford City Council.
5.) All City maintained public utilities (water/sanitary sewer/streets) must be installed or a financial guarantee posted prior to recording the final plat. All financial guarantees must comply with the UDO standards and accepted by the Sanford City Council.
SUBURBAN NEIGHBORHOOD
- Residential areas on the outskirts of a core urbanized area
- Facilitates large scale development of single family residential
- Walkable, with high degree of transportation connectivity between neighborhoods and surrounding network thoroughfares

Local Example - Westlake Valley Neighborhood in Sanford
Application for Time Limit Extension of Development Approval Request

1. Project Name: WESTFALL SUBDIVISION

2. Project Location: Intersection of Cool Springs Rd. and Valley Rd.

3. Project Description: Residential Subdivision with public water, sanitary sewer and streets.

4. Current Date of Expiration: July 17, 2011

5. Time Period of Extension Requested: 2 years
   The extension period requested shall be no longer than the original period of time granted.

6. Describe in detail the reason(s) that the developer was unable to proceed with the project within the period of the original expiration date. Conditions may be listed on an additional, separate sheet if necessary.
   In the last 10 years there has been little interest in lots this size because developers were more interested in high density subdivisions to satisfy the housing demand. The subdivision as proposed meets the current zoning requirements (R-20) and blends more with the surrounding neighborhoods. Currently a developer is interested in developing the subdivision as is.

7. Name of Property Owner: Albert C. Adcock
   If the property is owned by a company, please provide the name of a primary contact person also.

8. Address of Property Owner: P.O. Box 3367 Sanford, NC 27331

9. Phone Number of Property Owner: (919) 721-1042

10. Name of Applicant: Albert C. Adcock

11. Address of Applicant: P.O. Box 3367 Sanford, NC 27331

12. Phone Number of Applicant: (919) 721-1042

   Signature of Applicant
   (Please sign & print name)
   Albert C. Adcock
   12-17-19

   Signature of Property Owner or Authorized Representative
   (Please sign & print name)
   Albert C. Adcock
   12-17-19

Staff Use Only

Project Reference #: 12-12-13-A Date Form Received: 2/17/2017
Staff Signature & Title: [Signature] 2/17/2017
PRELIMINARY PLAT FOR WESTFALL SUBDIVISION
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VICINITY MAP - NTS
PRELIMINARY SUBDIVISION PLAT WITH PHASE LINES, FOR REFERENCE

WESTFALL SUBDIVISION
ROBERT SANFORD TOWNHOMES
LEE COUNTY, FLORIDA
DRAWN: JUNE 2012

SCALE: 1" = 100'

This drawing is intended to be used as a preliminary plat for the subdivision known as Westfall Subdivision, located in Lee County, Florida. It is drawn to scale of 1" = 100'.

Legend:
- "C" indicates a corner lot.
- "X" indicates an intersection.
- "A" indicates an agricultural area.
- "P" indicates a public utility area.
- "W" indicates a wetland area.

This plat is for preliminary review only and is subject to change. It is not intended for use in conveying title or for any other purpose.

1. The project includes both residential and commercial areas.
2. Public utilities will be developed in phases.
3. The project is subject to final review and approval.

TYPICAL SANFORD RESIDENTIAL STREET SECTION

PRELIMINARY FOR REVIEW ONLY
12-17-19 FOR TRC
MEMORANDUM

TO: Mayor Mann and Members of Council

FROM: Paul M. Weeks Jr., P.E.

DATE: January 27, 2020

SUBJECT: Award Design-Build Contract for Project Forge Water Line Extension and Access Road – Designer’s Fee

On December 22, 2019, a request for proposals was advertised in the Sanford Herald. Proposals were due by 2:00 pm on January 7, 2020. However only one proposal was received therefore this was re-advertised on January 12th. At 9 am on January 21st, one proposal was received and evaluated. The selected project team is Sanford Contractors/WithersRavenel. The results of the scoring can be found on the next page.

The Sanford Contractors/WithersRavenel team is currently working on Project Forge site development.

Sanford Contractors has undertaken a number of projects for the City and we find their work to be acceptable. They are pre-qualified by the Department of Transportation for roadway and utility work.
WithersRavenel has also completed a number of projects for the City and their work has been acceptable as well. They are pre-qualified by the Department of Transportation for roadway design and public water systems design work.

The first step in this contract is the design of the road and water line. Once the design work is complete, Sanford Contractors will develop a Guaranteed Maximum Price (GMP) for the construction of the roadway and waterline. Council will be presented with the GMP at a future meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Possible Points</th>
<th>Sanford Contractors</th>
<th>Fred Smith Company</th>
<th>Barnhill Contracting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cover Letter</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>no proposal received</td>
<td>no proposal received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Team Qualifications and Experience</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar Project Experience</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of the Project and Respondent's Approach</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff recommends that City Council award the designers fee portion of the Design Build contract to Sanford Contractors in the amount of $45,000.
MEMORANDUM

TO:      Mayor and Council Members  
          City Manager

FROM:    Susan C. Patterson, City Attorney

DATE:    February 4, 2020

SUBJECT: Offer Received to Purchase 1405 Boykin Avenue  
PIN 9642-64-6268

We have received an offer from Calin Davidson to purchase a vacant lot at 1405 Boykin Avenue, having PIN 9642-64-6268, in the amount of $1,000.00. Ms. Davidson owns adjoining property.

Attached is a Resolution to authorize the advertisement for Upset Bids to sell the property. If you have any questions, please let me know.
Hi Karen,

I would like to submit an offer on the lot addressed 1405 Boykin Ave.

I own the house at 1403, and the empty lot on the other side at 1401, and would love to complete the lot.

This is a formal offer of $1000.00.

Please let me know if this needs to be directed elsewhere, or if you have a different price in mind.

Thank you,
Calin Davidson
(919) 599 2393
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIN</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Parcel Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9642-64-6268-00</td>
<td>0.17392936</td>
<td>1405 BOYKIN AVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARID</td>
<td>Appraised Land</td>
<td>Appraised Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>964264626800</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Book</strong></td>
<td><strong>Page</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tax District</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>382</td>
<td>0667</td>
<td>CSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subdivision</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1405 BOYKIN AVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Legal 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owner</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SANFORD, CITY OF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mail Address</strong></td>
<td><strong>Legal 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mail Street</strong></td>
<td><strong>PC 4/369</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO BOX 3729</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mail State</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Out BLDG YRBLT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dwelling DESCR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appraised Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECTID 1</td>
<td>9699</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mail ADRSUF</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mail Zip</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27331</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sale Date</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/9/1986 12:00:00 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dwelling YRBLT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Out BLDG Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Out BLDG SFLA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TaxCard</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This site is prepared for the inventory of real property found within this jurisdiction and is compiled from recorded deeds, plats and other public records and data. Users of this site are hereby notified that the aforementioned public primary information sources should be consulted for verification of the information contained on this site. The County of Lee and Dude Solutions, Inc. assume no legal responsibility for the information contained on this site. Please be advised that you must contact the Lee County Tax Office for accurate tax values. Please contact the Lee County Appraisal Department if any building information is incorrect. The map, layer, data and website (collectively known as the layer) are for graphical and illustration purposes only. The Lee County Strategic Services Department (hereinafter the Department) provides the layer and the information contained within to the general public and has not customized the information for any specific or general purpose. Such information was generated from data maintained by different sources and agencies and as such, some limitations may apply based upon restrictions imposed by other sources or agencies supplying data to Lee County (hereinafter the County). While the Department strives to make the information on the GIS website as timely, reliable and accurate as possible, neither the Department nor the County local governments make any claims, promises, or guarantees about the accuracy, completeness or adequacy of the contents of the layer. Areas depicted are approximate and are not necessarily accurate to mapping, surveying or engineering standards. The County expressly disclaims liability for errors and omissions in the contents of this site and layer. No warranty of any type, implied, expressed, statutory, UCC or otherwise, including, but not limited to, the warranties of non-infringement of third party rights, title, accuracy of data, merchantability, or fitness for a particular purpose, is given with respect to the substantive content of this layer or its use in private or commercial financial transactions. The fact of distribution of the layer does not constitute any warranty, express, implied or otherwise. The user assumes the entire risk related to the use of this data. If the user intends to make any legal or financial decision based on this data, the user should independently verify the accuracy of the same. The Strategic Services Department and the Lee County local governments are providing this data "as is" in no event will any of the foregoing local governments or their officers and employees be liable to you or to any third party for any direct, indirect, incidental, consequential, special or exemplary damages or lost profit resulting from any use or misuse of this data. Unless otherwise noted on an individual document, files, documents, and information contained in this layer may be copied and distributed for non-commercial use, provided they are copied and distributed without alteration.

https://lee2.connectgis.com/DownloadFile.ashx?i=ags_mapff778d5580b8452d9bb01f9... 1/31/2020
RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE ADVERTISEMENT
OF AN OFFER TO PURCHASE 1405 BOYKIN AVENUE
HAVING PIN NUMBER 9642-64-6268
SANFORD, NORTH CAROLINA

WHEREAS, the City of Sanford obtained property by deed from Loyd Lyons and wife, Hannah C. Lyons, in Deed Book 382 Page 667 in the Office of the Register of Deeds for Lee County which property is more particularly described as follows:

BEING that certain property shown as Lot 6 on a plat entitled “Boundary Survey for Washington Park Redevelopment Area”, prepared by Central Carolina Surveyors, P.A., dated March 25, 1985, recorded April 17, 1985, as appears in Plat Cabinet 4 Slide 369, to which reference is made for a more complete description, and being a portion of Book 382 Page 667.

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Sanford desires to dispose of said property as being surplus to their needs;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Sanford as follows:

1. That the vacant property at 1405 Boykin Avenue having PIN 9642-64-6268, Sanford, North Carolina, hereinbefore described, is hereby declared to be surplus to the needs of the City of Sanford.

2. That an offer has been received from Calin Davidson, of Sanford, NC, to purchase the property for the sum of One thousand Dollars ($1,000.00).

3. The offeror shall deposit with the City of Sanford a sum equal to five percent (5%) of its offer. The deposit shall be retained until, either an upset bid is made, the offer is accepted and the sale is executed, or the offer is rejected.

4. The City Clerk shall cause a notice of such offer to be published in accordance with the requirements of N.C.G.S. 160A-269.

5. Within ten (10) days following the publication of the notice of such offer, any person may upset the bid by a written offer to purchase the property at a sum which is greater than the original offer by ten percent (10%) of the first One Thousand Dollars ($1,000.00) and five percent (5%) of the remainder, accompanied by a deposit of five percent (5%) of the increased bid, said sums to be paid either in cash, certified check, cashier’s check or bank money order. Bids with conditions or terms not contained in the original offer will not be accepted or considered. The highest qualifying bid becomes the new offer under consideration. In the case of identical bids, the one submitted earliest will be accepted as the high bid.
6. The City Clerk is directed, should a qualifying upset bid be received, to re-advertise the offer at the increased bid amount as often as is necessary until a final qualifying bid which has not been upset is received.

7. After a final bid is received and accepted by the City Council, the Mayor and Clerk are directed to execute a deed on behalf of the City Council to transfer such property to the highest bidder. The highest bidder shall pay all advertising costs associated with the sale. The City will reserve right and title to all utilities or easements of record.

8. The City Council may at any time reject any and all offers.

Adopted this the 4th day of February 2020.

______________________________
T. Chet Mann, Mayor

ATTEST:

______________________________
Vicki R. Cannady, Deputy City Clerk
Date: January 31, 2020
Re: Storage Room Space at Buggy Company Building
To: Sanford City Council
From: Hal Hegwer, City Manager

I am seeking your permission to lease additional space in the Buggy Building basement to accommodate storage of files, etc., for departments located in the facility. The County Manager has agreed to share one-half of the additional $325 cost ($162.50 each) per month.
Second Addendum to Commercial Lease Agreement
Between Progressive Development Company, LLC, County of Lee, City of Sanford and Sanford—Lee County Partnership for Prosperity
Filed 9/19/14

Premises:
The ground floor of the Buggy Building, storage rooms G-18, G-19, and G-20

Rent:
G18 is 66sf - $62/month
G19 is 116sf - $111/month
G20 is 160sf - $152/month
Total additional monthly rent for storage: $325

Additional monthly rent as shown above will begin on the __________ day of ____________________, 2020 by the tenants.

TENANTS:

CITY OF SANFORD
A North Carolina municipal corporation

By: ________________________________ [Seal]
Hal Hegwer, City Manager

COUNTY OF LEE
A body corporate and politic and one of the one hundred counties of the State of North Carolina

By: ________________________________ [Seal]
John Crumpton, County Manager

The terms of this Second Addendum are acknowledged and consented to by:

PROGRESSIVE DEVELOPMENT COMPANY, L.L.C.
A North Carolina limited liability company
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Second Quarter Highlights

(Comparisons are based on Second Quarter 2018-19 to Second Quarter 2019-20)

General Fund

Revenues
- Ad valorem tax
  - Taxes are collected by Lee County and posted as of the day received, therefore, fluctuation is due to when the customer pays; increase in tax rate in current year
- Vehicle Fee
  - First full year of vehicle fee implemented to help offset street paving expenses
- County Permits
  - Permit issued to Pfizer
- Sanitation Fees
  - Council elected to increase the sanitation fee by $45 per household

Expenditures
- Public Building
  - Timing of maintenance projects, purchase of property and capital equipment in prior year
- GF Contributions
  - Contribution to parks project in prior year
- Parks
  - First full year of new parks department
- Solid Waste
  - Purchase of leaf vac in prior year
- Debt Service
  - Timing of debt payment
## General Fund Revenue
### Second Quarter - 12/31/2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUE SOURCES</th>
<th>Total Budget 2019-2020</th>
<th>Received To Date 12/31/2019</th>
<th>Remaining Budget</th>
<th>Percent Received To Date 12/31/2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taxes All Other Years</strong></td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$350,510</td>
<td>($270,510)</td>
<td>438%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Year Taxes</strong></td>
<td>$16,341,059</td>
<td>$12,297,019</td>
<td>$4,044,040</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Penalties Less Discounts</strong></td>
<td>43,000</td>
<td>7,200</td>
<td>$35,800</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ad Valorem Taxes</strong></td>
<td>$16,464,059</td>
<td>$12,654,729</td>
<td>$3,809,330</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility Franchise Tax</strong></td>
<td>2,142,002</td>
<td>646,215</td>
<td>1,495,787</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Powell Bill</strong></td>
<td>778,945</td>
<td>799,869</td>
<td>(20,924)</td>
<td>103%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>911 Surcharge Reimbursement</strong></td>
<td>405,106</td>
<td>160,723</td>
<td>244,383</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consolidated Planning Services</strong></td>
<td>507,392</td>
<td>236,884</td>
<td>270,509</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Other Intergovernmental</strong></td>
<td>645,310</td>
<td>291,904</td>
<td>353,406</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disposal Tax</strong></td>
<td>20,337</td>
<td>5,737</td>
<td>14,600</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicle Fee - Prior Year</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>142,080</td>
<td>142,080</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vehicle Fee - Current Year</strong></td>
<td>690,000</td>
<td>182,820</td>
<td>507,180</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Sales Tax-Article 39</strong></td>
<td>2,460,418</td>
<td>626,364</td>
<td>1,834,054</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Sales Tax-Article 40</strong></td>
<td>1,170,958</td>
<td>311,321</td>
<td>859,637</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Sales Tax-Article 42</strong></td>
<td>1,230,209</td>
<td>291,235</td>
<td>938,974</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Sales Tax-Article 44</strong></td>
<td>1,017,232</td>
<td>301,945</td>
<td>715,287</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Taxes</strong></td>
<td>6,589,154</td>
<td>1,861,502</td>
<td>4,727,652</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City Permits</strong></td>
<td>263,000</td>
<td>136,126</td>
<td>126,874</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire Permits</strong></td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>6,840</td>
<td>23,160</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broadway Permits</strong></td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>9,442</td>
<td>(4,442)</td>
<td>189%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County Permits</strong></td>
<td>185,000</td>
<td>318,637</td>
<td>(133,637)</td>
<td>172%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Permits</strong></td>
<td>483,000</td>
<td>471,045</td>
<td>11,955</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sanitation Fees</strong></td>
<td>2,443,500</td>
<td>2,042,059</td>
<td>401,441</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sale of Property</strong></td>
<td>176,000</td>
<td>11,247</td>
<td>164,754</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sales and Service</strong></td>
<td>2,619,500</td>
<td>2,053,306</td>
<td>566,194</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green Fees Annual</strong></td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>55,594</td>
<td>(5,594)</td>
<td>111%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Green Fees Daily</strong></td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>121,925</td>
<td>68,075</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cart Fees</strong></td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>134,953</td>
<td>85,047</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Driving Range</strong></td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>9,176</td>
<td>5,825</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Golf</strong></td>
<td>96,500</td>
<td>52,293</td>
<td>44,207</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Golf</strong></td>
<td>571,500</td>
<td>373,940</td>
<td>197,560</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ABC Revenue</strong></td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Privilege Licenses</strong></td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>820</td>
<td>2,780</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Paving Charges</strong></td>
<td>225,000</td>
<td>69,550</td>
<td>155,450</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Appropriated Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>2,612,049</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,612,049</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Investment Income</strong></td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>104,049</td>
<td>195,951</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Installment Purchase Proceeds</strong></td>
<td>640,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>640,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>397,602</td>
<td>199,606</td>
<td>197,996</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other</strong></td>
<td>4,388,251</td>
<td>454,025</td>
<td>3,934,226</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL GENERAL FUND</strong></td>
<td>$35,594,219</td>
<td>$20,004,143</td>
<td>$15,590,076</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### General Fund Revenue

- **Second Quarter Comparisons**
  - **General Fund Revenue**
    - Comparisons: 12/31/2018 vs. 12/31/2019
    - Chart showing revenue comparisons for different categories.
## General Fund Expenditures
### Second Quarter - 12/31/2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>Total Budget 2019-2020</th>
<th>Expended To Date 12/31/2019</th>
<th>Remaining Budget</th>
<th>Percent Expended To Date 12/31/2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governing Body</td>
<td>$339,155</td>
<td>$145,367</td>
<td>$193,788</td>
<td>43% $135,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>354,369</td>
<td>179,265</td>
<td>175,104</td>
<td>51% 176,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resources</td>
<td>293,506</td>
<td>146,455</td>
<td>147,051</td>
<td>50% 143,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Management</td>
<td>73,062</td>
<td>42,445</td>
<td>30,617</td>
<td>58% 24,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elections</td>
<td>75,984</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75,984</td>
<td>0% -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>829,374</td>
<td>420,517</td>
<td>408,857</td>
<td>51% 360,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>402,934</td>
<td>190,963</td>
<td>211,971</td>
<td>47% 177,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>217,884</td>
<td>84,408</td>
<td>133,476</td>
<td>39% 81,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Building</td>
<td>648,477</td>
<td>264,443</td>
<td>384,034</td>
<td>41% 222,441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Office</td>
<td>19,777</td>
<td>9,301</td>
<td>10,476</td>
<td>47% 8,653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GF Contributions</td>
<td>2,907,491</td>
<td>2,086,287</td>
<td>821,204</td>
<td>72% 2,354,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet Maintenance</td>
<td>1,139,885</td>
<td>480,649</td>
<td>659,236</td>
<td>42% 505,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Fleet Maintenance Charges</td>
<td>(575,000)</td>
<td>(286,369)</td>
<td>(288,631)</td>
<td>50% (325,700)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td>810,232</td>
<td>366,013</td>
<td>444,219</td>
<td>45% 356,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Government</td>
<td>7,537,130</td>
<td>4,129,743</td>
<td>3,407,387</td>
<td>55% 4,423,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>10,481,129</td>
<td>5,149,289</td>
<td>5,331,840</td>
<td>49% 5,086,296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>5,529,659</td>
<td>2,502,031</td>
<td>3,027,628</td>
<td>45% 2,454,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection</td>
<td>707,673</td>
<td>240,885</td>
<td>466,788</td>
<td>34% 245,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety</td>
<td>16,718,461</td>
<td>7,692,205</td>
<td>8,026,256</td>
<td>47% 7,786,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street</td>
<td>2,367,938</td>
<td>987,774</td>
<td>1,380,164</td>
<td>42% 948,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Capital Imp.</td>
<td>1,879,742</td>
<td>116,992</td>
<td>1,762,750</td>
<td>6% 116,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets</td>
<td>4,247,680</td>
<td>1,104,766</td>
<td>3,142,914</td>
<td>26% 1,065,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>756,728</td>
<td>391,678</td>
<td>365,050</td>
<td>52% 345,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>422,073</td>
<td>151,336</td>
<td>270,737</td>
<td>36% 7,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>1,178,801</td>
<td>543,014</td>
<td>635,787</td>
<td>46% 353,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste</td>
<td>1,454,640</td>
<td>730,397</td>
<td>724,243</td>
<td>50% 911,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td>1,388,848</td>
<td>570,998</td>
<td>797,850</td>
<td>42% 513,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation</td>
<td>2,823,488</td>
<td>1,301,395</td>
<td>1,522,093</td>
<td>46% 1,424,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>1,423,005</td>
<td>624,440</td>
<td>798,565</td>
<td>44% 664,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Enhance. - Code Enforcement</td>
<td>358,709</td>
<td>128,030</td>
<td>230,679</td>
<td>36% 143,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm. Enhance. - Planning / HPC</td>
<td>169,729</td>
<td>57,667</td>
<td>112,062</td>
<td>34% 69,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>1,951,443</td>
<td>810,137</td>
<td>1,141,306</td>
<td>42% 877,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>1,137,216</td>
<td>270,329</td>
<td>866,887</td>
<td>24% 151,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL GENERAL FUND</td>
<td>$35,594,219</td>
<td>$16,051,590</td>
<td>$19,542,629</td>
<td>45% $16,081,425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Second Quarter Comparisons

![General Fund Expenditures Comparison Chart](chart.png)

- **General Fund Expenditures**: Second Quarter - 12/31/2019
- **12/31/2018**: $16,081,425
FY 2019-2020
Second Quarter Highlights

(Comparisons are based on Second Quarter 2018-19 to Second Quarter 2019-20)

Utility Fund

Revenues
- User charges
  - Decrease in coal ash leachate disposal
- Build American Bonds Rebate
  - Refinancing of bonds

Expenses
- Debt Service
  - Refinance of bond debt
- UF Contributions
  - Contribution to Project Forge in current year
- Engineering
  - Addition of new position and replacement of vehicles in current year
- Water Filtration
  - Pumping additional water to Chatham County, timing of chemical order, pump repair, repairs to administration building, and purchase of gear box
- Distribution and Collection
  - Timing of meter exchange, insurance and bonds, interfund services, and capital expenses
- Sewer Capital
  - Capital projects are completed at various times of the year / timing of project completion
### Utility Fund Revenue

**Second Quarter - 12/31/2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUE SOURCES</th>
<th>Total Budget 2019-2020</th>
<th>Received To Date 12/31/2019</th>
<th>Remaining Budget</th>
<th>Percent Received To Date 12/31/2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Charges</strong></td>
<td>$11,695,688</td>
<td>$5,093,475</td>
<td>$6,602,213</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewer Charges</strong></td>
<td>8,683,586</td>
<td>3,649,933</td>
<td>5,033,653</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taps and Connections</strong></td>
<td>135,000</td>
<td>61,681</td>
<td>73,320</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>315,000</td>
<td>147,974</td>
<td>167,026</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total User Charges</strong></td>
<td>20,829,274</td>
<td>8,953,062</td>
<td>11,876,212</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special Assessments</strong></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>41,972</td>
<td>(41,872)</td>
<td>1972%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interest on Revenue Bonds</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>(41.775)</td>
<td>DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interest Income</strong></td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>137,839</td>
<td>162,161</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retained Earnings</strong></td>
<td>5,177,525</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,177,525</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td>152,000</td>
<td>63,070</td>
<td>88,930</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other</strong></td>
<td>5,629,625</td>
<td>243,561</td>
<td>5,386,744</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Build American Bonds Rebate</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,935</td>
<td>(15,935)</td>
<td>DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intergovernmental</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,935</td>
<td>(15,935)</td>
<td>DIV/0!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL UTILITY FUND</strong></td>
<td>$26,458,899</td>
<td>$9,212,558</td>
<td>$17,247,021</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Second Quarter Comparisons**

Utility Fund Revenue

- **Intgov.**
- **User Charges**
- **Other**

- **12/31/2019**
- **12/31/2018**
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## Utility Fund Expenses

**Second Quarter - 12/31/2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEPARTMENT</th>
<th>Total Budget 2019-2020</th>
<th>Expended To Date 12/31/2019</th>
<th>Remaining Budget</th>
<th>Percent Expended To Date 12/31/2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UTILITY FUND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service</td>
<td>$4,921,780</td>
<td>$967,889</td>
<td>$3,953,891</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF Contributions</td>
<td>1,995,407</td>
<td>1,561,081</td>
<td>434,326</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1,995,407</td>
<td>1,561,081</td>
<td>434,326</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Administration</td>
<td>2,623,210</td>
<td>1,221,453</td>
<td>1,401,757</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1,101,778</td>
<td>508,225</td>
<td>593,553</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Administration</td>
<td>584,712</td>
<td>284,354</td>
<td>300,358</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Filtration</td>
<td>2,840,882</td>
<td>1,248,017</td>
<td>1,592,865</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Reclamation</td>
<td>2,485,101</td>
<td>1,130,699</td>
<td>1,354,402</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution and Collection</td>
<td>6,048,582</td>
<td>2,779,733</td>
<td>3,268,848</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Capital Imp.</td>
<td>1,565,466</td>
<td>191,087</td>
<td>1,374,379</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Capital Imp.</td>
<td>2,153,651</td>
<td>463,771</td>
<td>1,689,880</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse</td>
<td>343,331</td>
<td>148,939</td>
<td>194,392</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Warehouse</td>
<td>(205,000)</td>
<td>(82,781)</td>
<td>(122,219)</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Utilities</td>
<td>19,541,712</td>
<td>7,893,498</td>
<td>11,648,214</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL UTILITY FUND</strong></td>
<td>$26,458,899</td>
<td>$10,422,468</td>
<td>$16,036,431</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Second Quarter Comparisons

**Utility Fund Expenses**

- **Debt Service**: $2,000,000
- **Other**: $4,000,000
- **Public Utilities**: $6,000,000
- **Total**: $8,000,000

- **Debt Service (2018)**: $1,500,000
- **Other (2018)**: $3,000,000
- **Public Utilities (2018)**: $4,500,000

- **Total (2018)**: $8,000,000

---
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## Municipal Service District Revenue and Expenditures
### Second Quarter - 12/31/2019

### REVENUE SOURCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Total Budget 2019-2020</th>
<th>Received To Date 12/31/2019</th>
<th>Remaining Budget</th>
<th>Percent Received To Date 12/31/2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Year Taxes</td>
<td>$75,493</td>
<td>$63,110</td>
<td>$12,383</td>
<td>84% $46,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Year Taxes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>(33)</td>
<td>#DIV/0! 428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Tax</td>
<td>2,860</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>2,017</td>
<td>#DIV/0! 1,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penalties Less Discounts</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>#DIV/0! 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad Valorem</td>
<td>78,353</td>
<td>63,988</td>
<td>14,365</td>
<td>82% 48,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance Appropriation</td>
<td>15,343</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,343</td>
<td>0% -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution from General Fund</td>
<td>67,732</td>
<td>27,545</td>
<td>40,187</td>
<td>41% 27,005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>1,651</td>
<td>34% 1,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Other</strong></td>
<td><strong>85,575</strong></td>
<td><strong>28,394</strong></td>
<td><strong>57,181</strong></td>
<td><strong>33% 28,188</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MUNICIPAL SERVICE DIST.</strong></td>
<td><strong>$163,928</strong></td>
<td><strong>$92,382</strong></td>
<td><strong>$71,546</strong></td>
<td><strong>56% $76,402</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DEPARTMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Total Budget 2019-2020</th>
<th>Expended To Date 12/31/2019</th>
<th>Remaining Budget</th>
<th>Percent Expended To Date 12/31/2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expense</td>
<td>$163,928</td>
<td>$44,297</td>
<td>$119,631</td>
<td>27% $46,232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MUNICIPAL SERVICE DIST.</strong></td>
<td><strong>$163,928</strong></td>
<td><strong>$44,297</strong></td>
<td><strong>$119,631</strong></td>
<td><strong>27% $46,232</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Second Quarter Comparisons

#### Municipal Service District Revenue

- Ad Valorem
- Other

#### Municipal Service District Expenditures

- Operating Expense

- Second Quarter Comparisons
- 12/31/2018
- 12/31/2019
### Community Development Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project No. or Fund</th>
<th>Budget To Date</th>
<th>Revenue To Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenway Project</td>
<td>481,330</td>
<td>481,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation Project</td>
<td>4,905,728</td>
<td>4,918,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCDOT Wicker Street Sidewalk</td>
<td>464,000</td>
<td>92,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urgent Repair Program (URP18)</td>
<td>111,194</td>
<td>61,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essential Single Family Rehab (2018)</td>
<td>175,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG Neighborhood Revitalization</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>15,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urgent Repair Program (URP19)</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Survey and National Registry</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCDOT Bikeped Planning Study</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanford Mural Restoration</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Fincher Bldg Reuse Grant</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caterpillar Building Reuse Rural Center Grant</td>
<td>532,500</td>
<td>532,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triad Corrugated Metal Reuse Rural Center Grant</td>
<td>97,750</td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Forge-Site Prep / Roadway</td>
<td>2,964,600</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development Program Income</td>
<td>200,543</td>
<td>693,667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Community Development**  
$11,045,645$  
$8,267,420$  
$6,298,727$

### Water, Sewer, and Street Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Budget To Date</th>
<th>Revenue To Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hawkins Avenue Waterline Improvement</td>
<td>11,804,008</td>
<td>11,855,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Asset Inventory &amp; Assessment Mgmt.</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>74,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC Highway 42 Waterline Relocate</td>
<td>507,270</td>
<td>459,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amos Bridges Water Main</td>
<td>2,056,600</td>
<td>2,064,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater Asset Inventory &amp; Assessment Mgmt.</td>
<td>165,000</td>
<td>158,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Remediation Project A</td>
<td>900,000</td>
<td>900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moncure Megasite Wastewater Project</td>
<td>18,000,000</td>
<td>17,884,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Assessment Project</td>
<td>1,776,851</td>
<td>1,537,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewerline Extension - Raleigh Exec Jetport</td>
<td>3,078,088</td>
<td>2,106,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big Buffalo Water Reclamation Rehabilitation</td>
<td>415,000</td>
<td>415,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Carolina/Triassic Park Water &amp; Sewer</td>
<td>3,375,204</td>
<td>3,375,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Forge - Infrastructure Improvements</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>1,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Water, Sewer, and Street**  
$45,243,021$  
$42,331,417$  
$31,267,586$
### GOLF SUMMARY OF REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUE SOURCE</th>
<th>BUDGET 2019-2020</th>
<th>RECEIVED 12/31/2019</th>
<th>RECEIVED TO DATE</th>
<th>BUDGET VS. ACTUAL</th>
<th>RECEIVED 12/31/2018</th>
<th>CY ACTUAL VS. PY ACTUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INC./DEC. %</td>
<td>INC./DEC. %</td>
<td>INC./DEC. %</td>
<td>INC./DEC. %</td>
<td>INC./DEC. %</td>
<td>INC./DEC. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Fees Annual</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>53,225.24</td>
<td>2,368.41</td>
<td>55,593.65</td>
<td>5,593.65</td>
<td>111.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111.19%</td>
<td>55,021.25</td>
<td>572.40</td>
<td>1.04%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Fees Daily</td>
<td>190,000</td>
<td>76,590.76</td>
<td>45,334.39</td>
<td>121,925.15</td>
<td>(68,074.85)</td>
<td>64.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.17%</td>
<td>108,475.51</td>
<td>13,449.64</td>
<td>12.40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cart Fees</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>85,164.79</td>
<td>49,788.54</td>
<td>134,953.33</td>
<td>(85,046.67)</td>
<td>61.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61.34%</td>
<td>117,126.42</td>
<td>17,826.91</td>
<td>15.22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving Range Fees</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>5,602.00</td>
<td>3,573.50</td>
<td>9,175.50</td>
<td>(5,824.50)</td>
<td>61.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61.17%</td>
<td>6,854.50</td>
<td>2,321.00</td>
<td>33.86%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>96,500</td>
<td>28,685.13</td>
<td>23,607.47</td>
<td>52,292.60</td>
<td>(44,207.40)</td>
<td>54.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54.19%</td>
<td>53,760.25</td>
<td>(1,467.65)</td>
<td>-2.73%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL GOLF REVENUE</td>
<td>571,500</td>
<td>249,267.92</td>
<td>124,672.31</td>
<td>373,940.23</td>
<td>(197,559.77)</td>
<td>65.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65.43%</td>
<td>341,237.93</td>
<td>32,702.30</td>
<td>9.58%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GOLF SUMMARY OF EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENDITURE</th>
<th>BUDGET 2019-2020</th>
<th>EXPENDED 12/31/2019</th>
<th>EXPENDED TO DATE</th>
<th>BUDGET VS. ACTUAL</th>
<th>EXPENDED 12/31/2018</th>
<th>CY ACTUAL VS. PY ACTUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INC./DEC. %</td>
<td>INC./DEC. %</td>
<td>INC./DEC. %</td>
<td>INC./DEC. %</td>
<td>INC./DEC. %</td>
<td>INC./DEC. %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Salaries and Fringes</td>
<td>495,299</td>
<td>116,171.25</td>
<td>124,892.46</td>
<td>241,063.71</td>
<td>(254,235.29)</td>
<td>48.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48.67%</td>
<td>232,321.71</td>
<td>8,742.00</td>
<td>3.76%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating</td>
<td>226,685</td>
<td>62,285.20</td>
<td>50,886.21</td>
<td>113,171.41</td>
<td>(113,513.59)</td>
<td>49.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49.92%</td>
<td>109,581.95</td>
<td>3,589.46</td>
<td>3.28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installment Purchase</td>
<td>2,744</td>
<td>2,003.57</td>
<td>739.52</td>
<td>2,743.09</td>
<td>(0.91)</td>
<td>99.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>99.97%</td>
<td>4,007.14</td>
<td>(1,264.05)</td>
<td>-31.54%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Outlay</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>30,950.00</td>
<td>3,750.00</td>
<td>34,700.00</td>
<td>2,700.00</td>
<td>108.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>108.44%</td>
<td>34,700.00</td>
<td>#DIV/0!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL GOLF EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>756,728</td>
<td>211,410.02</td>
<td>180,268.19</td>
<td>391,678.21</td>
<td>(365,049.79)</td>
<td>51.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51.76%</td>
<td>345,910.80</td>
<td>45,767.41</td>
<td>13.23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SANFORD CARES SUMMARY OF REVENUES
12/31/2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUE SOURCE</th>
<th>06/30/19</th>
<th>JULY</th>
<th>AUGUST</th>
<th>SEPT.</th>
<th>09/30/19</th>
<th>OCT.</th>
<th>NOV.</th>
<th>DEC.</th>
<th>12/31/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Round Up</td>
<td>8,409.09</td>
<td>694.79</td>
<td>757.20</td>
<td>721.59</td>
<td>10,582.67</td>
<td>741.86</td>
<td>695.62</td>
<td>786.24</td>
<td>12,806.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-Time Donations</td>
<td>3,882.05</td>
<td>102.53</td>
<td>69.69</td>
<td>85.15</td>
<td>4,139.42</td>
<td>66.37</td>
<td>19.49</td>
<td>107.58</td>
<td>4,332.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>94.12</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td>123.52</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>147.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SANFORD CARES REVENUE</td>
<td>12,385.26</td>
<td>807.78</td>
<td>836.50</td>
<td>816.07</td>
<td>14,845.61</td>
<td>817.01</td>
<td>722.51</td>
<td>902.03</td>
<td>17,287.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SANFORD CARES SUMMARY OF EXPENDITURES
12/31/2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECT OF EXPENDITURE</th>
<th>TO DATE 06/30/19</th>
<th>EXPENDED JULY</th>
<th>EXPENDED AUGUST</th>
<th>EXPENDED SEPT.</th>
<th>TO DATE 09/30/19</th>
<th>EXPENDED OCT.</th>
<th>EXPENDED NOV.</th>
<th>EXPENDED DEC.</th>
<th>TO DATE 12/31/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Assistance Fund</td>
<td>6,735.03</td>
<td>300.41</td>
<td>348.10</td>
<td>423.61</td>
<td>7,807.15</td>
<td>527.03</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>181.43</td>
<td>8,715.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SANFORD CARES EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>300.41</td>
<td>348.10</td>
<td>423.61</td>
<td>7,807.15</td>
<td>527.03</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>181.43</td>
<td>8,715.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| AMOUNTS AVAILABLE FOR BENEFITS | 12,385.26 | 12,892.63 | 13,381.03 | 13,773.49 | 7,038.46 | 7,328.44 | 7,850.95 | 8,571.55 | 8,571.55 |
| NO. OF CUSTOMERS ASSISTED | 106 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 122 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 133 |
| NO. OF CUSTOMERS PAID | 1,052 | 1,074 | 1,013 | 1,022 | 965 | 1,090 |
### SANFORD TOURISM DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (TDA) SUMMARY OF REVENUES

12/31/2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REVENUE SOURCE</th>
<th>BUDGET 19-20</th>
<th>RECEIVED FIRST QTR.</th>
<th>RECEIVED OCTOBER</th>
<th>RECEIVED NOVEMBER</th>
<th>RECEIVED DECEMBER</th>
<th>RECEIVED SECOND QTR. TO DATE</th>
<th>RECEIVED TO DATE 12/31/2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Room Occupancy Tax</td>
<td>28,111.18</td>
<td>24,521.83</td>
<td>22,689.91</td>
<td>27,918.62</td>
<td>75,130.36</td>
<td>103,241.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room Occupancy Tax Penalties</td>
<td>134.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>134.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL TDA REVENUE** 230,000.00

### SANFORD TOURISM DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (TDA) SUMMARY OF EXPENDITURES

12/31/2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECT OF EXPENDITURE</th>
<th>BUDGET 19-20</th>
<th>EXPENDED FIRST QTR.</th>
<th>EXPENDED OCTOBER</th>
<th>EXPENDED NOVEMBER</th>
<th>EXPENDED DECEMBER</th>
<th>EXPENDED SECOND QTR. TO DATE</th>
<th>EXPENDED TO DATE 12/31/2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distrib. Tourism Dev Auth</td>
<td>28,111.18</td>
<td>24,656.06</td>
<td>22,689.91</td>
<td>27,918.62</td>
<td>75,264.59</td>
<td>103,375.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL TDA EXPENDITURES** 230,000.00

**REVENUES LESS EXPENDITURES** 0.00
Note) Per Lee County, there was a posting error in August 2019 for June occupancy tax collections that was corrected in July (as collections are reported two months behind). The error resulted in June 2019 numbers being lower than actual and July 2019 numbers being higher than actual.
CLOSED SESSION