

**TOWN OF WEDDINGTON  
REGULAR TOWN COUNCIL MEETING  
MONDAY, MARCH 12, 2012 - 7:00 P.M.  
MINUTES**

The Town Council of the Town of Weddington, North Carolina, met in a Regular Session at the Weddington Town Hall, 1924 Weddington Road, Weddington, NC 28104 on March 12, 2012, with Mayor Walker F. Davidson presiding.

Present: Mayor Walker F. Davidson, Mayor Pro Tem Daniel Barry, Councilmembers Werner Thomisser, Pamela Hadley and Barbara Harrison, Town Attorney Anthony Fox, Town Planner Jordan Cook, Finance Officer Leslie Gaylord and Town Administrator/Clerk Amy S. McCollum

Absent: None

Visitors: Genny Reid, Richard Sahlie, Judy Johnston, Bill Price, David Basri, John Houston, Sam Lowe, Dave Ruths, Andrew Moore, James Rushton, Monica Rushton, Walton Hogan, Jim Vivian, Butch Plyler, Mickey Key, Brenda Stone, Julie A. Moore, James David Sloop, Jr., Marsha Mayhew, Janice Sloop, Robert J. Wilbur, Mike Davis, Jerry McKee, Bob Rapp, Chrys V. Nikopoulos, Mary Ann Maxson, Mike Maxson, Dan Cook, Leslie Barry, Carol Hogan, Commissioner Tracey Kuehler, Parks Long, Joe DeSimone, Bruce Johnston, Cory Riback, Taylor Basri, Vickie Basri, Jim Morgan, Ken Evans, Daryl Matthews, Steven Carow, Jarrin Tucker, Joshua Dye, Spencer Dobbins, Pat Harrison, Andy Stallings, Andrew Stallings, Steven McLendon and Tommy Price

Mayor Walker F. Davidson offered the Invocation prior to the opening of the meeting.

**Item No. 1. Call to Order.** Mayor Davidson called the March 12, 2012 Regular Town Council Meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

**Item No. 2. Pledge of Allegiance.** Boy Scout Troop #101 from St. Margaret's Church led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

**Item No. 3. Determination of Quorum.** There was a quorum.

**Item No. 4. Presentations.**

**A. Western Union Fire Safety – A Concerned Citizens Group.** Mr. David Basri - Thank you for allowing us to speak. This has been a very emotional issue for a lot of people. I represent a group of citizens that decided to call itself Western Union Fire Safety. We are not affiliated with or represent the Wesley Chapel VFD or the Providence VFD. We do believe that merger is the best long-term solution for Weddington and western Union County. We think it is a question of taxes, funding and the role of government. We do not think it has anything whatsoever to do with quality of service because we think both fire departments already provide and will continue to provide excellent service. I can tell you if it goes to a municipal fire district and I am covered by Providence, I will not lose one second of sleep worrying over the quality of service that I am going to get. I thought I would start by talking about what it is that we can agree on. The trained personnel with the right equipment should be dispatched from the closest location when called. What we are concerned with is how that is funded and what the long term prospects are both for the fire departments and for the Town of Weddington. Mayor Davidson provided this map for me. The yellow dots represent the Wesley Chapel EMTs. I asked Chief Dye to provide the same information for Providence. I would still be happy to add that to the map. The red line represents

Wesley Chapel VFD's current fire district. The green area at the top represents what Providence has as its current fire district and the light colored area that is sandwiched in between the purple and green areas is the area that the Town is proposing moving from the Wesley Chapel fire tax district into Providence. Under a municipal fire district scenario, Providence would then encompass the green and the yellow. We are going to talk about whether or not that is a good idea and why. Today when there is a fire call both departments receive the call and are dispatched. We have two different districts and they are both sent. In a case where it is an area that is covered exclusively by Wesley Chapel VFD and they have two stations they currently dispatch from multiple stations on fire calls. If there was a merger, multiple stations would be dispatched and if there were a municipal fire district, multiple stations would be dispatched. It really makes no difference from a fire perspective whether it is a merger or a municipal fire district. What about medical? In medical calls one or the other department is dispatched. Today if you look at the map there are situations where people live closer to the Providence station than they do to Wesley Chapel VFD. Given the way that the districts are set up, Wesley Chapel has to come from further away. We totally agree that is nuts. However, under a merger all the stations and staff would still exist, all the EMTs and firefighters would still exist and whoever is closest would be dispatched. If you went with a municipal fire district, you still are going to have multiple jurisdictions. You are actually moving the problem rather than solving the problem. There are going to be jurisdictional lines and it is not going to be quite even. The other big controversy has to do with the 24/7 coverage that is currently being provided by Providence and Wesley Chapel does it through a distributed system. I am not going to argue about that. Essentially Wesley Chapel has already agreed in writing that if the taxpayers in the area want to pay for that service at the Providence station then it is not a problem. So either way if you want it and want to pay for it - you can have it. Under a merger you are going to utilize three stations, the firefighters, equipment and the EMTs. It is really kind of the same under a municipal with the difference that you are still going to have jurisdictional boundaries where in the case of EMTs there is going to be a decision based on where the lines are as to where the dispatch takes place. We have three stations. We have a lot of trained people and we have a lot of equipment. Why are we arguing about which side of the line a neighborhood house is on as to whether it gets dispatched from here or there? If you recall from the map, you are going to have a set of lines. What is the point of that? We have three stations and they are well distributed and we have a lot of trained people. If you would merge, you can consolidate some of the administrative requirements such as payroll, reporting, etc. Under a merger, if you took that red line and you moved it over to cover the green area you would have a tax base of \$6.17 billion of valuation. If you do a municipal fire district, you have a total tax base of \$1.96 billion. That has to be used to fund the Providence operating budget. It also has to pay for the contract that the Town has to negotiate with Wesley Chapel VFD and with Stallings VFD. Weddington is going to say that we are totally financially responsible and we now have to pay for this. Our point as Western Union Fire Safety is simply when you are paying for things with property taxes we would like as many property taxpayers as we can get to help pay for that. What is the likely tax rate under a merger? Wesley Chapel has said that 3 cents per \$100 would allow them to pay for their operation and the Providence operation. Under a municipal fire district, you have to split up the area. The expanded Providence area if you look at the property valuation in that area to pay for the current Providence operating budget not counting any capital improvements requires a 4 cent rate. That is out of Mayor Davidson's numbers. They would have to blend that with whatever Wesley Chapel VFD and Stallings VFD charges them for covering those areas. No matter how you look at it - it is not going to be cheaper. A consolidated department can manage all of its assets - you have one entity, one tax district, one rate and one jurisdiction. Under a municipal fire district, Wesley Chapel has to make up \$135,000 a year in revenue that is being taken away from them but there is no offset in costs savings. They are going to still have to cover 36 square miles of area. They are going to still have to provide EMTs and they are going to have to be dispatched on all the fire calls. There is a zero costs savings for Wesley Chapel. You are simply taking \$135,000 away and putting it over here to help fund Providence and they have got to make it up somewhere. Under a merger Union County has current and clear statutory authority to do this. They already have the tax districts and they have the authority and they are already collecting the taxes. It is very clear that they can do this. Under a municipal fire district, Attorney Fox has already written several

opinions saying that it is a very convoluted path at best. It involves the County and it may involve the State or a local act – regardless it is certainly not a clear path. For a municipal fire district, Mayor Davidson advised in the February meeting when Mr. Barry said he would rather move the lines that it has been asked and answered. The County does not want to move the lines. Creating a municipal fire district is moving the lines. You are taking the green area and you are moving it over to the yellow area and you are splitting it off from Wesley Chapel and you have a blended rate. It is moving the lines. It is under the name of a Municipal Fire District. Under a merger Weddington gets out of the fire and emergency service funding business. Weddington backed into this about 10 years ago with a very small subsidy to Providence. That small subsidy is now \$265,000. It is half of the property taxes that are collected by the Town of Weddington. If you merge the departments the responsibility goes back to Union County and it goes to a combined \$6.17 billion tax base. If you do a municipal fire district, the Town of Weddington now and forever is saying we are completely responsible with our \$1.9 billion dollar tax base for funding the whole entire area. Union County is responsible as they are currently mandated and have the authority. Under the municipal fire district, after you get it approved through the pathway that we do not understand you have to annually negotiate contracts with three different fire departments. It is clearly not more efficient to do that. Under a merger Weddington is out of the picture in terms of funding fire. It goes back to the County where it belongs and they are responsible as they are mandated to be. Under a municipal fire district, again the Town is now fully funding basic services. My fear is that 10 years from now it is going to be a municipal fire department and that is going to make today's budgets look like white noise. What should be next? It is very clear that a merger is a viable option. It was taken off the table last meeting without a formal vote. There was a letter presented from Providence which was accepted as game over and the Council said we are going to pursue two options: continuing subsidizing Providence and doing a municipal fire district. That is not careful deliberation. Clearly merger is a viable option and it should be put back on the table. Service and quality options need to be evaluated. I do not know the answer. Has 24/7 service actually materially provided better service? There are incident reports at Union County for the last 10 years that can be evaluated. If it turns out that there is a material advantage that is worth the cost, I will join the argument and say we ought to do it. If it turns out that there is not a significant improvement in service quality then why are we spending the money? Either way it is this body's responsibility to know the answer to that question. If you do not know the answer to that question, slow down and go find out. Mayor Davidson, you said to me when we met, that you would rather see more people involved even if they are opposed to your position; you now have more people involved and some of them are opposed to your position. It is clear that it is a big deal. Let's start representing everybody again, get the two viable options back on the table, find out whether 24/7 is really worth it and let's move on from there. What I am asking you to do is deliberate and not manipulate the process.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry – Early in your presentation you made the comment that 24/7 coverage can be continued at Providence if we want to pay for that.

Mr. Basri – If the taxpayer wanted to pay for it.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry – If the Town wants to pay for that out of its general fund it would be the taxpayers' money. If we are doing that through mutual aid, we are automatically paying 24/7 to the entire district for fire service.

Mr. Basri – For fire service, not for EMT.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry – If the taxpayer is paying for 24/7 coverage out of Providence then they are in effect providing that service across the entire district. Only the taxpayers in Weddington are paying for the 24/7 coverage that is being utilized in unincorporated Union County.

Mr. Basri – Does Providence respond to the entire district?

Mayor Pro Tem Barry – For mutual aid.

Mr. Butch Plyler – When it is a fire, both stations are called.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry – Is there any record about who is showing up first through these mutual aid agreements?

Mr. Plyler – I am sure there is. I would go back for about 10 years to get that record.

**B. Weddington Voters for Public Safety – An Active Citizens Group.** My name is Andrew Moore and I live in Providence Woods. I have been involved with this issue since a meeting at the Providence fire station was organized in June of 2011. At that time my reaction was, "Tell me how much I need to pay, and I'll write you a check," because I believed, as I still do, that there is no price that can replace someone in my family or replace the safe haven of my home. I am here tonight representing the Weddington Voters for Public Safety, a group of actively engaged citizens. We are the residents of this Town that cared enough about this ongoing public safety issue to vote in the November 2011 election. We are the residents of this Town that took the time to research the facts, read the papers, showed up to many of the meetings at the Town and even the county level. We are the residents of this Town that made sure to educate ourselves prior to the elections in November so that we could vote for candidates we felt would deal with this issue with at least as much due diligence as we did. It is my belief that, with the exception of only one candidate, all those candidates in the election ran on a platform to approve the Town's resolution to become a municipal fire district. How curious is it that immediately after the election several of the candidates took a 180 degree turn in their positions?

We support the newly elected Town leaders in their efforts to adopt a Weddington municipal fire service. We support the Town leaders' due diligence to continue to educate themselves during this time of exploration. We support the Town leaders as they recognize the importance of 24/7 staffing in the station to protect our homes and families - this means a professional, trained firefighter/EMT will be physically on call in the building. Our Town leaders want to protect Providence VFD and the investment the residents of this Town have made. It would take at least \$5 million to replace the assets on Hemby Road, which is currently free and clear of any debt. Finally, we support the Town in the belief that public safety is the number one priority for any town.

Last week, I received a brochure promoting a merger between the Wesley Chapel VFD and the Providence VFD. Interestingly, it came after the Providence Board of Directors formally handed the Weddington Town Council a letter stating they had unanimously voted to no longer consider a merger as an option. Where was this group before? Why didn't they put out the brochure earlier in this yearlong process if they were concerned? They could have made this a big part of the election and voted against the candidates who favored the municipal service. Regardless, through our democratic process, those who favored the municipal fire service were elected and the citizens of Weddington made their wishes clear. Public safety was, and is, of paramount importance to them and they are not willing to give up Providence VFD or its 24/7 in-station service.

Democratic process notwithstanding, this group sent out a brochure to all Weddington residents. Upon reading my copy, I realized that it made many false and inaccurate statements. I believe these need to be addressed with the facts once and for all - no emotion or politics - so that we may move forward knowing that we are acting on the best interests of the citizens of the Town of Weddington. As a point of information, all of the facts that I will share with you today are a matter of public record and are accessible through minutes of Town and county meetings as well as the fire study that was commissioned by Union County. Other than my own personal experiences, all the information was taken from those sources.

**Fact #1:** The level of service will not improve if a merger happens with Wesley Chapel VFD. In fact, it will probably go down because the station will not be staffed at night. Wesley Chapel has said they will not offer the 24/7 in-station service unless Weddington pays extra for it. Because of this 24/7 in-station service, Providence VFD is often the first on the scene when providing mutual aid assistance to neighboring fire departments. In fact, it will continue to benefit Wesley Chapel's fire district if Weddington becomes a municipal fire district and continues its 24/7 in-station service, as it improves the response time for many of their citizens in the event of a fire or emergency.

The average response time in February of this year for Providence VFD was 5.81 minutes to calls in their fire district and mutual aid calls to neighboring departments which is second to none in Union County. I had the opportunity to witness the incredibly rapid and professional response of Providence VFD at one of the meetings I attended. It was held at the fire hall, and as I sat there discussing the issues with 40 to 50 other people, a call came in and the tone sounded. Immediately after the tone, the complete fire crew was dressed with appropriate equipment, on the truck, and out of the fire building in under a minute. It was a real life demonstration of the professional and efficient fire department Providence represents.

We live in an area where there are few fire hydrants and because of this time is of the essence and responding with the appropriate apparatus is essential in saving our homes. The reality is that if the Providence station no longer offers night-time staffing, this would mean an extra 5 to 10 minutes of travel time to respond to a call, plus the added time it takes for the volunteers to arrive at the stations and get the apparatus on the road.

The citizens of Weddington have made it clear that 24/7 in-station service is very important to them. At the meetings I have attended, this has been an issue that many citizens have spoken about as being something they do not want to give up. (In addition, Providence VFD is the most centrally located within the Town of Weddington - right on the major arteries that run throughout the Town. This also helps with those rapid response times.) So, I think it is plain to everyone that we cannot expect an "improved service level" if there is a merger.

**Fact #2:** Weddington will be able to have control over its own municipal fire service. Merging with Wesley Chapel VFD will cause Weddington to forever relinquish any control over fire and EMT services. Weddington will lose control of the operation of the station, its facilities, its future growth and costs. Do we really want this? A merger was mentioned in a fire study that was commissioned by Union County to study all the fire departments within the affected area, but it was not recommended; it was suggested as a consideration. It was considered by both the Providence VFD and the Wesley Chapel VFD Board of Directors from February 2011 to August 2011. Unfortunately, these merger talks were not successful because of the difference in operating models between the departments. The lifestyles of the residents of Weddington are not conducive to attracting the needed pool of candidates to volunteer as firefighters and EMT's at the Providence station. This challenges them to use a combination of part-time volunteers and paid firefighters and EMTs.

Providence has publicly commended Wesley Chapel on the success of their operating model but also recognizes that the model will not work for the Providence district if the departments were merged. In fact, the fire study that the brochure authors reference when they say Union County recommended a merger, actually did say, and I quote, "It should be noted that one agency, Providence VFD, had excellent advanced Standards of Cover . . ." and also regarding Providence it stated, "This is considered an excellent model to aspire to for all in-county fire departments."

So, a merger will jeopardize our 24/7 in-station service unless the current Providence VFD has significant control over how service will be delivered. A takeover by Wesley Chapel VFD will not provide that

opportunity. In fact, it would remove the "excellent model" that the authors of the fire study felt all other fire departments in Union County should aspire to be.

The brochure also stated that public safety - fire and medic - is a Union County responsibility. Though this may be the case, it appears from my own experience that they don't see it that way. I was there when the County Commissioners deferred the Town's request for help on solving our fire and medical safety problem to the Fire Commission. When the Town made a presentation of the problem to the Fire Commission and asked them to move the fire district lines that have been inappropriate for 27 years so citizens would be served by the station closest to where they lived, they also refused to discuss the matter. It is the county's responsibility, but when the county does not act, the Town has to assume the responsibility for the safety of its residents.

**Fact #3:** Having a municipal fire district would allow us, the citizens of Weddington, to control costs. This seems to be the central area of concern for those who authored the brochure, but they are obviously misinformed. They make the statement that a merger is more cost effective, yet the president of the Wesley Chapel VFD and the president of the Providence VFD stated publicly that if the departments merge, the fire tax for the combined districts will have to go up. In addition, Wesley Chapel VFD has over \$6 million in current debt while Providence VFD is currently debt-free.

Where I believe the true misunderstanding lies is in what the cost will be to Weddington residents if a municipal fire district is implemented. The current tax rate for Weddington citizens is 3 cents and, depending on where you live in the Town you are either paying a \$100 fire fee for Providence VFD or a 2.2 cent tax to Wesley Chapel VFD. Upon adoption of the municipal fire district, Weddington residents would no longer pay either the fire fee or the 2.2 cents tax to Wesley Chapel VFD. Instead, we all would pay a total tax of about 5.2 cents to the Town of Weddington. This rate would ensure that we would continue to have our 24/7 in-station service and would still be equal to or below the tax rate that would be charged if we merged with Wesley Chapel, where we would not receive our 24/7 in-station service. In addition, a merger between the two departments would immediately give the citizens served by Providence the tax responsibility to retire the tremendous debt at Wesley Chapel. Do we really want to be financially responsible for the new Wesley Chapel fire station that is more than twice the size of that recommended by the fire study as sufficient for their needs and tax base?

Another concern of those authoring the brochure was the expense of upgrades for Providence VFD, inferring that a merger would save the taxpayer this expense. However, the need to upgrade the Providence station will be required even if the two departments merge. We must understand that a merger does not solve the funding issues of Providence and the expenses have to be covered through taxes. When you add the financial needs of Providence to the debt, the need for future equipment, and the operating cost of Wesley Chapel, it is not difficult to see the potential for significant tax increases in the future.

Those authoring the brochure also stated that Providence VFD has done no planning nor made any estimates regarding future maintenance. This is also untrue. The Providence Board provides a copy of their budget and expenses to the Town every month. They budget every year for maintenance on every piece of equipment and their facility. In our opinion, they not only plan for future maintenance, they implement the plan and keep the Town informed of the status. According to the fire study, they have the highest rated, best maintained equipment in the county achieved by the professional implementation of their plan.

So, it seems clear to me that the most responsible choice which considers cost, safety, and local control is that of the municipal fire district. I know that I would be more comfortable with my Town controlling the fire service funding, so that I might have a voice through my vote on the spending and operation of the fire department that serves me. Weddington should take care of its own needs and not rely on other

communities to absorb costs that do not belong to them. It is wrong to ask Wesley Chapel, Marvin, or other areas to pay for our fire services and wrong of them to expect us to pay for theirs.

Although there were other false or inaccurate statements in the brochure, I have answered those most relevant to the issue at hand. I believe the benefits of becoming a municipal fire district are overwhelming. Those benefits include:

- the continuation of 24/7 staffed (in station) services
- the county does not allow fire departments to budget for a reserve for fire apparatus, therefore, the Town's ability to set the fire tax rate will provide ample revenue to reserve for future fire apparatus needs
- the Town will finally begin to partner with fire departments to provide a vital service without the cost and time-expense of managing day-to-day functions
- the Town of Weddington will have the flexibility to monitor and adjust service areas for closest and fastest response to meet current and future growth needs
- independent fire departments will remain independent and will continue to be contracted with the Town for services
- the Town will have the flexibility to raise the standards of service without county input
- as a municipal fire district, the citizens of Weddington will have one municipal fire tax rate.

We can finally begin to regard ourselves as Weddington residents who receive the fastest response possible based on proximity to the nearest station or from a station with in-the-station personnel prepared to reach your emergency with the proper blend of qualifications and equipment.

Knowing all the benefits of a municipal fire district, let's once-and-for-all put this idea of a merger behind us and enact what the voting citizens of Weddington have already asked you to do: make the Town of Weddington a fire municipality and ensure the safety of our families and homes. Show us that you believe public safety is the number one priority for the Town of Weddington.

Councilmember Thomisser – At the beginning of your comments you indicated that we had an election in November and because of that election the people of Weddington expressed their decision for the type of fire service that they wanted. Do you know what the voter turnout was?

Mr. Moore – Probably pretty low.

Councilmember Thomisser – It was 19%. You made a statement that the Wesley Chapel VFD was carrying \$6 million in debt. I would like to ask the President of the Wesley Chapel VFD Board of Directors if that is an accurate statement.

Mr. Plyler – More like 5 than 6.

**Item No. 5. Public Comments.**

Mr. Sam Lowe – I am hearing that you do not know if the State is involved with what you may do with that line between Wesley Chapel VFD and Providence VFD. I heard in one of these presentations that the State may be involved in it. Some of these things that have been passed around is that there will be no tax increase. Everything I hear here tonight says tax increase.

Mr. Bill Price – I would like you to address the issue of the WCWAA. Has it been settled? If so, when and where and what costs to the taxpayers of Weddington? If it has not, can we expect a federal lawsuit?

Mr. Richard Sahlie – I have heard the presentation that we are going to save all of this money if we merge and the service is not going to deteriorate but it is going to be just as it is now. Unfortunately, that is not true. We are talking about the safety of our property and the safety of ourselves. Let's not minimize this issue. The other night when some of the people went to the County to hear this issue discussed, on the way back there was a fire in our neighborhood. That is in the Wesley Chapel district. Providence VFD arrived five minutes earlier. How much is five minutes if you have a fire in your house? That could be very serious. You are talking about the difference in two models. One is firemen are in the firehouse and can get into the truck and be on the road in less than a minute. In the case of Wesley Chapel VFD, they are not around at night or a good portion of it. They have to page people who are on call then they have to go to the fire station and get the truck. What is being paid now for 24/7 service is in the benefit of the people in the Wesley Chapel district. Personally I do not mind paying \$100 more a year. I want the first thing to be response time with qualified people on the job. Another statement that was made is if we merge that will be effective and cheaper. How well does that model work - centralized versus decentralized? Is the federal government more efficient than the State government? Is the State government more efficient than the local government?

Providence VFD Chief Joshua Dye – I am here to address the statements of the Western Union Fire Service brochure saying that three members of the Providence VFD Board live in Mecklenburg County so why should they care about our taxes. Providence VFD was founded in 1954 by some of the same residents that founded this Town. They realized that the Board should include up to three firefighters so that business decisions would include inputting them as experts on the front lines. These three firefighters in question live just across the line between Union and Mecklenburg Counties. Providence started out serving areas for Waxhaw all the way north of the Arboretum and still serves one development in Mecklenburg County. Two of the firefighters have been volunteers for the Providence VFD for 25 years each and a third has been with the department for four years. He is also a career firefighter with the City of Monroe for 12 years. One of the 25 year veterans actually started working in the fire service in 1974 and served as chief of our department for nine years. Under his leadership Providence VFD became the first department in Union County to use automatic defibrillators on medical calls and the Department of Insurance rating was lowered to an ISO rating of a straight 6 lowering all the homeowners insurance. This individual also negotiated the purchase of one of the department's fire engines, their tanker and brush truck. Another 25 year veteran is a career Charlotte firefighter that lived in Union County for over 15 years and served Providence for over 25. He is not only a firefighter but also an EMT and a paramedic. He also served as an Assistant Chief for Providence for eight years. These three individuals have dedicated a major portion of their lives to our public safety and rather than ridiculing them we should thank them for all the service they have given this Town.

Commissioner Tracy Kuehler - *Council agreed to allow Commissioner Kuehler to speak longer than the three minute time limit.* The first presentation was a very well presented argument but what came from the same group was this brochure we keep hearing about. A week ago I was handed this brochure by Mr. Thomisser at my County Commissioner meeting and was asked to look through it. That brochure had quite a different tone than the presentation that was delivered here tonight claiming to deliver facts. The second group did a good job at dispelling some of the inconsistencies in that brochure. I was the Fire Commissioner for two years and part of the board that commissioned the infamous fire study. I do not know how many people have read the fire study cover to cover but I have more than once. There are many suggestions and recommendations that are contained in that study. Some of them are talked about over and over and over. Some have already been completely ignored. And others may or may not ever be implemented. One thing that the study does recognize and clarify is that there are alternatives available for each identified issue within that study and that the ultimate decision may be to do nothing. It also states that these are political decisions that need to be made locally based on local resources, local concerns and ability or inability to pay for fire protection and political influence. Part of the brochure talked about the access to more EMTs and firefighters. Mr. Barry, you brought up about the mutual aid. The County has



mutual aid agreements with every fire department in the County which means that you have access to firefighters within your district, to the district south of you, to the district north of you. That currently exists now and even aside from the firefighters, from an EMT perspective, in the event there is not response from the district where you live the next closest district is automatically toned. You have access to everybody already. The other thing I keep hearing is that public safety, fire and medic is a Union County responsibility. That is totally false. No county in the State of North Carolina has an obligation to provide or fund fire or EMT services nor do we even have the duty to contract for the provision of those services. In fact, many of you may not even realize that the statutory authority that has been given to us, not mandated upon us, but if we chose. The statute that allows us to create a fire service district did not even come about until the 1970s and then it was a response from the General Assembly to allow counties to give options of municipal type services to unincorporated county residents that lived around the area. It was a way for the County to create an area that could issue services that the person next door was getting under a municipality thinking that the municipality was already providing those services. That does not seem to be the case in Union County because there is only one municipality that I know of that provides its own fire service. The County has no obligation statutorily to provide that. The brochure then directs you to a website that claims to lay out all the facts. If you really look hard there are some facts there and quite a few distorted truths but mostly it is an opinion website and opinions and discussion and debate is good. This one has been going on for a while. The most glaring discrepancies were statements such as moving the lines creates a precedent and the County is not going to do that. The district lines were just moved in 2007. It is not like an act of God – we have just done it with Wesley Chapel and Waxhaw. The original fire line according to the experts was supposed to go right down the center of my property. The other statement that Wesley Chapel's EMTs are equipped with the same tools and supplies that are kept on the trucks. That defies logic and if they do what does that cost? There is no way that someone leaving their home in a personal vehicle to come to an accident without going and getting the equipment from the fire station is equipped the same as a person who left the fire station with the rescue truck. That is when 24/7 service becomes an issue because one is at the station with the truck and the other one may not be and could be anywhere within a 40 mile district. Lastly and the one that irritates me the most is the statement that there is no chance that the Hemby Road station would go away no matter what option is implemented. Every fire station in this county is its own independent business. They have their own governance structure, they have their own bylaws, their own bank accounts and they own all their own assets including the land, buildings and the trucks - they own it all. It is weird because the taxpayer dollars is what bought it. The decision to close a station is the decision of that fire station and theirs alone. Because they own everything they can dispose of those assets in any manner consistent with the rules governing a non-profit organization. The County, the Town, and the people - no one has any control over the decision over those assets. We have no control over whether there is or is not a fire station there. We need to stop saying that there will always be one there because my crystal ball does not work that well. That is the decision of the fire department. Perhaps the presentation that you heard here tonight about a merger should not have been made to the Weddington Town Council but should have been made to the Providence VFD because it is their choice. I have heard to take the emotion out of it. I do not know how realistic that is considering personal safety is a pretty emotional subject. At least we can be responsible and honest in our dissemination of the information and have conversations that are not orchestrated to incite and evoke things that are not true just to say things to put out there for shock value.

Ms. Judy Johnston – I live in Providence Woods South and I am on the Board of Directors for the Providence VFD. Weddington is a community of families who care about their quality of life. Providence was founded nearly 60 years ago by our neighbors. Many of these families still reside in this beautiful Town. Over the years the men and women who have volunteered their time and energy to support the vital needs of our community have never asked for special recognition or acknowledgement. They have been content to simply volunteer their expertise to our Town. Our elected Town officials have set a course to provide the highest level of local oversight to vital emergency services by considering the establishment of a municipal fire service. The County has the authority to move fire district lines. The county has the

authority to modify the revenue structure for fire departments. The County does not have the authority to force a merger between two independent fire departments. Why is that their focus? Make no mistake about it, some of our County Commissioners are dedicated to usurping the authority of the residents of the Town of Weddington. The duly elected representatives of this Town have petitioned the County Commissioners on multiple occasions and there has been no action taken. These County Commissioners have a master plan for control of vital fire and medical services in Western Union County. The voices of the people spoke through the democratic process of election in November. Let's remind the County Commissioners that their fiduciary responsibilities are to manage fire district lines and tax structures. As emphasized in the most recent County Commissioner meeting by Commissioner Tracy Kuehler the lines make no sense and the County has consistently ignored action to move the lines and change the tax structure for Providence VFD. The County is not going to do it for us. They have a different agenda all together. The Town must move forward with a municipal fire district which affords the greatest flexibility in providing for the residents of the Town. Do not allow the hidden agenda of some members of the County Commission to delay your stated goals. Move forward with the establishment of the municipal fire area.

Ms. Brenda Stone – I have lived in Providence Woods South for over 23 years. I am speaking out on this issue because it is important. I want to go on record as being in favor of making Weddington a municipal fire district. I believe that this is the only way those of us who live here can maintain control over the services we need to protect our homes and families. Everyone who has weighed in on this issue including those who now oppose it say that this is the best option for this area. On October 10, Mr. Thomisser said, "It is time for us to step up with a municipal fire district." Former mayoral candidate Stephanie Belcher said about a move to a municipal fire district that it "will allow the Town to put a common sense safety plan in place that directs the closest volunteer fire department to be the primary station for each household. Simply put the closest station to each home should be primary for an emergency call for the associated fire tax revenue." Could not have said it better myself. Now these folks oppose making Weddington a municipal fire district on the grounds that the costs would be prohibitive. Providence VFD President Jack Parks presented three options on three separate occasions to both residents and Town Council members before the last election that showed that the costs could range from a 7 to 8 cents fire tax if we do not move the lines which are almost 30 years old or a 3 to 5 cent fire tax if we merge with Wesley Chapel. He also showed that their figures showed that with a tax rate of 5 cents Providence could continue the excellent service my family has enjoyed for over 23 years without further assistance from the Town. I want to applaud Mayor Davidson for the rational way he has approached this issue and for restoring our faith in our elected officials by actually doing what he said he would do if elected. He proposes to actually discover the facts and present both the pros and the cons to the citizens of Weddington before making a decision. That is a sound and intelligent approach and we should all support it.

Mr. Joe DeSimone – I am currently the president of the Willow Oaks Homeowners Association. I am here to encourage the Town Council to stay the course and proceed with making Weddington its own fire tax district. A merger with Wesley Chapel VFD would not be in the best interest of the Town. At our annual meeting which was held just a few weeks ago the residents were very vocal in their opposition to a merger. Quick response of EMS and fire is of utmost importance to our community. We feel that a merger with Wesley Chapel would not ensure that our residents be guaranteed the superb response and quality of service that they currently receive 24/7.

*Mr. Jerry McKee requested since he was a former Councilmember to receive the same amount of time as given to County Commissioner Kuehler. Council agreed to allow him to speaker longer than the three minute time limit.* Mr. McKee - Last Friday in the Union County Weekly, Mayor Davidson wrote the following, "many Weddington residents received a mailing last week from a group named Western Union Fire Safety or WUFS. The mailing did not list the names of the members of WUFS nor did it indicate who paid for the mailing. Listing names usually adds credibility to a cause but maybe not in this case." At the

end during Council Comments I want Mayor Davidson to say that the Western Union Fire Safety has no credibility. You knew who was on that committee before you wrote this piece in the paper. *Because of comments made to Councilwoman Harrison, Mayor Davidson advised that Mr. McKee had two minutes to finish his comments.* After last Monday's County Commissioner meeting, I saw an email from someone saying the same things almost word for word. Who is getting what talking points from whom? This was taped to my mailbox and has no one's name on it and does not say who paid for it – is this credible, Mayor? I want to go on public record in front of everyone here and this Council that I made a mistake in favoring a possible municipal fire district. I wanted Weddington to get out of the funding of fire services. After I had moved in that direction, I found out that it is not going to change. It is still going to come out of Weddington's property tax. That is why I changed my position. I am proud to admit that I made a mistake. I hope that other people will do the same. After the Closed Session recently, the Town Council came out and voted down having the Moser Group represent the Town with regard to them finding suitable property for a YMCA, Library, and park for Weddington. Also Discovery Place also showed an interest in being in that facility. There would have been a 55+ community, which would be very helpful to people in the Town of Weddington. I hope that you will get copies of the minutes of what your Council did behind closed doors without any public input.

Ms. Genny Reid – I care about Weddington and I am very interested in a positive future for our Town. You are considering a municipal fire district for Weddington in regards to Providence VFD. I believe this change will assure response time to the nearest home will be more efficient and safe. Last Friday and Saturday for a few hours I went to the Weddington Shopping Center with a petition asking to support Weddington to become a municipal fire district and to declare jurisdiction over fire and EMT services. I collected 19 signatures. Every one that I approached was enthusiastic in signing the petition. I did not have any opposition. Today I went to Providence Woods South and collected 11 signatures. I had the same response except for a couple that was not familiar with the situation to be willing to sign the petition. I collected 30 signatures. No one was against a municipal fire district. Providence VFD is 24/7. Last Monday, County Commissioner Tracy Kuehler said that the lines do not make sense. They do not. This issue is about priority, safety and property values. A municipal fire district will unify Weddington and make fire safety a priority. Regarding 24/7, last week there was a fire call in my neighborhood. It was after 5:00 and Providence VFD got there five minutes before Wesley Chapel VFD. On Wednesday, there was a call right off of my street and Providence got there first. I urge you to vote in favor of a municipal fire district.

Mr. Ken Evans – I am the Vice President of the Providence VFD. I congratulate Wesley Chapel VFD since last August in reducing their debt according to their treasurer from \$6 million down to \$5 million. I know that financing the department is one of the major concerns from all of us here and what is it really going to cost and how much. Werner has brought up several times capital improvements. Capital improvements are going to continue with a fire department over a number of years. Yes, Providence does need to renovate the building for 24/7 coverage because right now we are out of compliance. If we go into a merger, the renovations are still going to have to happen. Based on Wesley Chapel's track record, do you want another Taj Mahal? We are talking about \$1.5 million not \$4 to \$5 million. The fire study recommended 8,000 to 9,000 square feet and not 24,000 for Wesley Chapel. If we go with capital improvements and renovations, Providence's renovations are minor renovations and not major ones. The comment has been made that with a merger Wesley Chapel will provide 24/7 service in the Providence area if Weddington is willing to pay for it. The amount of money that Weddington is paying now according to Union Safety is \$265,000 a year. That money pays for 24/7 service only. If we have a merger and we do continue 24/7 service Weddington is still on the tab for \$265,000 a year. Make a decision and let Providence move forward.

Mr. Taylor Basri – What would be the cost for 24/7 from Wesley Chapel VFD? Does the 3 cent tax include 24-hour service? Is the debt of Wesley Chapel because of the new station? Does the new station hold fire, police and EMT?

Mr. Jim Morgan – I am new to Weddington. I have two little girls and schools were a big part of our move but then I realized we were going rural and it was something different from me moving from the middle of Charlotte. I started to understand about fire safety. When I understood what we were provided by the Providence VFD it weighted my decision to move and to make the purchase that we did. We have heard a lot of talk about costs but the real question is not about costs; it is about the extra five minutes that it may take for someone to get to my house for one of my little girls. You cannot put a price on that.

Mr. Mike Maxson – I live in the Wesley Chapel district and have received excellent service from that organization over the last 15 years that I have lived in this Town. You live close to Providence and you want good service there as well. Let's forget the trucks and forget the buildings, what makes the fire department is the people. If you do not have people to drive the trucks, you do not have people to staff the organization, you do not have anything. I know I cannot get an answer from the Providence VFD but I know you have three people 24/7 – how many volunteers are there? The Wesley Chapel VFD has 71 volunteers. In 25 years they have had three chiefs. How many chiefs has Providence had in the last five years? I think there has been a lot of turnover there. I would like you to think about the people in this process - the people that are involved and who is really dedicated to serving our community. Based on my experience, there is no finer fire department around as far as I am concerned. Combining any organization with the Wesley Chapel VFD would be a plus for our community.

Mr. Mike Davis – I live in Lake Providence. I want to read a letter that was sent to Mayor Davidson on March 9 and to the Council regarding the proposed merger between the Wesley Chapel VFD and the Providence VFD. *The Wesley Chapel VFD Board of Directors at the meeting on Wednesday, March 7 of this year issued a unanimous proclamation that we have no intention of closing the Providence station should a merger take place and further more we would utilize all existing equipment, paid staff, and any personnel that wished to continue their service with the Providence station. Everyone needs to understand that there has to be a fire station located in that area so that all of the residents of this area can benefit from the favorable insurance ratings. The Wesley Chapel VFD stands ready to move ahead with the merger talks should the Town of Weddington decide that is the best solution. This letter was signed by Charles Rowland, Secretary of the Board of Directors for the Wesley Chapel VFD.* In the first presentation I thought there was a very deliberate attempt to diffuse the high emotions that are surrounding this issue. A few months ago, it was said that nothing was going to happen and it would be six to eight months before anything happened. Things are happening every six to eight hours and a lot is going on and that has done nothing but incite the emotion. People have talked about the voter turnout - shame on those that did not vote. A small percentage of people did and if anything good comes out of this I hope that there are more informed citizens of the Town of Weddington to get involved and let their voices be heard. Regarding the website from the Western Union Fire Safety - there have been 125 registered residents to that website with 2,200 page hits and 336 visitors of some unique quality that have shown some interest. It is about getting good information. Bad information is worse than none. I think it would be in the best interest of knowing what has gone on here tonight and the past several months, I think it is incumbent on this board to clean up the facts.

Wesley Chapel VFD Steven McLendon – One of the things that was brought up was 24/7 staffing. Although I cannot stand in front of you now and tell you that there are people at both of our fire stations 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, I can tell you that we do have service 24/7. We have a combination of six members during the day and four members during the night that do respond 24 hours a day. With that said, when you look at what staffing consists of I think the Council throughout this process needs to consider what resources are you getting if 911 is called. There have been comments made about

Providence VFD beating us to calls. Those comments are correct. There is no doubt that their fire station is closer to certain areas than ours. Their personnel are there 24/7; therefore, they can theoretically beat us there. However, you must consider the additional resources that we are also bringing. For one of the incidents discussed we responded with two additional engine companies and a ladder company and 16 personnel. Had that been an actual fire those resources would have had to be utilized to mitigate the situation. It takes both departments. Chief Josh Dye and I have a great relationship. We had a call the other day, they beat us there. I went to shake his hand after the situation and said I appreciate your help. We need each other. At the end of the day it comes down to what resources you are getting. There is a difference in the resources. Although the resources may not be in the station all the time the resources are responding to the incidences. I have the 2011 preliminary report that shows that on a structure fire, we averaged 14 personnel last year. On a motor vehicle accident with entrapment we averaged 17 personnel. For an average vehicle accident we averaged 13 personnel. These are large numbers and it is due to the large amount of people that are dedicated to volunteering in our organization. I have a big stance on safety. We had a tragic accident in 2007 where one of our members lost his life responding to a call. I have told all of our members I do not want them driving recklessly or as fast as they can for the simple fact so they can say that we beat them to a call. That is not what it is about. It is about providing that service. Yes, they may beat us to a call. I am not denying that but at the end of the day we are still providing a phenomenal service. We put a tremendous amount of resources and personnel on the scene and I think that is an unbeatable system.

Ms. Heather Perryman - Jeff and I live in Weddington and have for the past 15 years. We have had to use emergency services for myself and twice for my youngest daughter. We do care about who responds to our needs. I was a paramedic for 15 years and I know that it does matter what name is on the side of that truck. Yes, we all want someone to come to our aid quickly but the quality of care should matter even more. At a Union County Commissioner meeting we attended, Wesley Chapel's Butch Plyler stood up and spelled "M-O-N-E-Y" mattered to them, not once did he mention the people that live here in Weddington mattered to them. Wesley Chapel wants more revenue to pay for their new multi-million dollar station. They have stretched themselves so thin and they are worried that Weddington will take "roof tops" from Wesley Chapel. Wesley Chapel's #1 concern has been about money. I was on the Steering Committee between Wesley Chapel and Providence VFD, where all we heard is that they would not give up "one roof top" to Providence VFD even though those citizens or as Wesley Chapel calls us "roof tops" of Weddington were closer to Providence VFD. That proved to me that Wesley Chapel's concern is only about money. Butch Plyler at the Steering Committee meeting said, "The tax rate will have to increase in Wesley Chapel's district to pay for the new station." Butch Plyler also said, "They (Wesley Chapel's Board of Directors) did not want to go to Wesley Chapel's Mayor about increasing the tax rate to cover their new station, but if this merger did not happen they would have to ask for a tax increase." To merge (I call it a take over based on meetings with Wesley Chapel's Board of Directors) would increase taxes and Wesley Chapel could use Providence VFD as an excuse to raise taxes. We want Providence VFD to keep the staff they have, keep the Board members they have, and keep the location they have. I was on the Providence VFD Board of Directors and I know the Board that is seated currently has the best interest of all citizens of Weddington and the Providence VFD firefighters/EMTs take pride in their jobs and will arrive promptly to take care of us in our time of need. We are for Weddington taking over its boundaries and protecting the citizens of Weddington. We are for an increase in our taxes to help cover the cost of keeping Providence VFD. We are for an increase in our taxes if the Weddington Municipal Fire District is chosen. You get what you pay for and we all need to step up and support Providence VFD or support a Weddington Municipal Fire District. We do not want a Wesley Chapel merger/take over. Just so we are heard loud and clear: We do not support Wesley Chapel, we live in Weddington, if we wanted to live in Wesley Chapel, we would have moved there. We expect the Weddington Town Council to do what is right for the citizens of Weddington. We support Providence VFD and/or a Weddington Municipal Fire District.

**Item No. 6. Additions, Deletions and/or Adoption of the Agenda.** Mayor Davidson asked to move Item 9 on the agenda to in front of Item 8. Councilwoman Barbara Harrison moved to approve the agenda with the change requested by Mayor Davidson. The vote on the motion is as follows:

AYES: Councilmembers Thomisser, Hadley and Harrison  
NAYS: Mayor Pro Tem Barry

Attorney Fox reviewed the Rules of Procedures to see if unanimous approval of the agenda was required.

Mayor Davidson agreed to leave the agenda as originally proposed. All Council agreed to the approval of the agenda without the requested change.

**Item No. 7. Approval of Minutes.**

**A. January 9, 2012 Regular Town Council Meeting.** Mayor Pro Tem Barry moved to approve the January 9, 2012 Regular Town Council Meeting minutes. All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

AYES: Councilmembers Thomisser, Hadley, Harrison and Mayor Pro Tem Barry  
NAYS: None

**Item No. 8. Public Hearings and Consideration of Public Hearings.**

**A. Public Hearing to Review a Voluntary Non-Contiguous Annexation Request Pursuant to G.S. 160A-58.2 – New Town Market.** Mayor Davidson opened the public hearing to review the voluntary non-contiguous annexation request for New Town Market. Town Planner Jordan Cook reviewed the following information:

- The Town received a voluntary satellite annexation request on November 15, 2011 of three parcels on 6.177 acres located on the Northwest quadrant of New Town Road and Providence Road. Known as New Town Market.
- The three parcels are existing commercial uses rezoned by Union County in 2004 and 2007 by a Special Use Permit. The property is currently zoned B-4 per Union County.
- The current tenants include:
  - Bank of America
  - The Goddard School
  - Donato’s Pizza
  - Rouge Salon
  - Java’s Brewing Bakery & Café
  - Allstate
  - Piper Glen Cleaners
  - New Town Dentistry
- This area is included in the Weddington Sphere of Influence per the approved Marvin-Weddington Annexation Agreement of 2001 (good until December 31, 2020).
- This area was also included in the study boundary on the 2002 Land Use Plan and given a “Business” designation.
- The Town Attorney has stated that the proposed satellite annexation meets all statutory requirements.
- The Town Council called for the Public Hearing at their February 13, 2012 meeting and asked that the Planning Board review the proposed annexation and provide feedback to the Town Council.
- Town Attorney Anthony Fox prepared a memo for the Town Council on February 9<sup>th</sup>. All items mentioned on Attorney Fox’s memo have been addressed by the applicant.

- The Planning Board reviewed this annexation petition on February 27<sup>th</sup> and gave it a unanimous unfavorable recommendation. A separate memo detailing the Planning Board's concerns has been included.

At the February 27<sup>th</sup> Planning Board meeting the Planning Board voted unanimously to give the New Town Market annexation petition an unfavorable recommendation. Below are the comments from that meeting:

1. Adjacent properties could develop under County zoning and regulations and then ask to be annexed by Weddington.
2. Does this set a precedent?
3. It is a non-conforming commercial development. The current development does not meet our standards for MX zoning.
4. Providence Road/Weddington Road area should be major commercial area.
5. Only benefit is tax revenue.
6. Not contiguous (satellite annexation).
7. What would the future development of Southwest and Southeast corners look like?

The Town Council also received the following:

- Letter dated February 9, 2012 from Attorney Anthony Fox regarding the New Town Market Voluntary Annexation
- Petition requesting annexation dated November 15, 2011
- Legal Description of the Property
- Record Plat – 6.177 Acres (New Town Market – Map 1)
- Letter dated September 9, 2008 from Union County Land Use Administrator Lee Jenson regarding the zoning and compliance of Union County Tax Parcels 06-183-004F, 06-183-005 and 06-183-022.
- Special Use Permit Granted August 2, 2004
- Special Use Permit Granted December 3, 2007
- Descriptions of the Zoning Districts
- Zoning Map
- Aerial Map

Town Planner Cook – One of the requirements is a 60-day notice of this proposed annexation to be sent to the municipalities that we currently have annexation agreements with. This annexation ordinance if approved cannot be approved or voted on until the May 14 meeting but if it were denied it could be done tonight.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry - What is the real precedent that was giving the Planning Board so much concern? Is that a real concern?

Town Planner Cook - They asked if this set a precedent and I advised that I did not think it did. I think there is a feeling that they would have to annex the adjacent properties if asked.

Town Planner Cook and Council discussed which areas were in Marvin's and Weddington's Sphere of Influence areas.

Town Attorney - The only beneficial argument that one would derive for an adjacent parcel is that this property has a certain zoning classification that they are also seeking and therefore it would no longer be

spot zoning. The fact that they may have that argument does not restrict or limit your legislative powers if you choose to not change the zoning on it. You as a governing body have the power to zone or rezone.

Councilmember Thomisser - The Planning Board had concerns that it is a non-conforming commercial development. The current development does not meet our standards for M-X zoning. Can you expound on that?

Town Planner Cook - This development was developed and approved under County zoning not under Town zoning. Our zoning standards are much more strict or stringent than the County's. We require 10% open space on any kind of commercial development - this does not have 10% open space. There is a playground at the daycare but that would not meet our standards for open space. There are internally lit signs on the buildings and in the development. We do not allow those. There is street landscaping that we require that does not exist here. We require a 25 foot setback on both road frontages and we do not allow parking to be in that 25 foot setback. We like the parking to be pushed back. Parking in this development is within that 25 foot setback. Daycares have to be on at least three acres in the Town. This daycare is on 1.9 acres. There are some things they probably comply with.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry - Did anybody talk with them about changing their signage and adding landscaping?

Town Planner Cook - We have not talked with them about it. In some cases if they were repairing a sign they would be forced to do it.

Attorney Fox - If there was a change of a use - expansion of that nonconforming use, then they have to comply with the then existing zoning requirements.

Mr. Bill Price – This property has a concern for me because it was part of my relatives' farm. As a young boy growing up and as a young man visiting relatives in talking with them they did not discuss this. Weddington and Marvin existed at that time as communities. Communities in this area usually took on the name of a school, church or a prominent person in the community. In hearing relatives discuss this area they considered themselves part of Waxhaw and not Weddington and not Marvin. What is an identity? Has the Town of Weddington lost its identity? I think so. It has annexed areas around this area that were not considered part of Weddington. If you annex this area as a part of Weddington, you are going against the persons' interests that lived in this Town. It is time that the Town of Weddington stops the sprawl and looks after the residents it already has. Take care of them and not just a select few. All of Western Union County is not Weddington. Look after the people that you already have and do something for them.

Mr. Jerry McKee – We went through forced annexation and at the time Mr. Barry and myself had the conversation about people's right to be able to do what they would like to do. I do not know why anybody wants to be annexed into Weddington. They have a reason for it. You have the authority to approve or deny anyone's request for anything. You are the governing body of the Town of Weddington. I go down there quite a bit and spend my money. If they want to be in Weddington – let them come in and welcome them.

Ms. Marsha Mayhew – I am here on behalf of the applicant. We are the managing agent for New Town Market. We were sorry about the Planning Board's vote to recommend that you not accept us. We thought it was a win-win situation when we came in. Union County is dry. We have had interest from restaurants that would like to be able to offer sit down facilities but they want to offer wine and beer. Right now we have a good coffee shop, sandwich shops but we cannot go beyond that if we do not have alcohol sales. That is what is in it for us. We are willing to come into Weddington and pay whatever additional taxes are incurred. Your Land Use Plan does show it as commercial so to that extent we really did not anticipate that being a concern on the part of the Planning Board. That surprised us. It goes



without saying that there would be a tax benefit to your community. We are non-compliant. We were approved in Union County. We cannot undo that. There are things that can be adjusted. We understand that coming into Weddington at that point we comply with the Weddington guidelines. There is one building that is not yet built; it is designed to be a two-story office building. It would have to be set back further than the existing buildings do now. The parking is already in the interior and that would not encroach. Only the parking encroaches into the setbacks. In terms of signage, it is typically the tenant's responsibility along with the upfit of the interior. We would be happy to work with Weddington to look for signage that is more appropriate to the guidelines and phase new signage in. The landscaping is about half way of what it needs to be. You usually plan for it to mature within a 5 to 10 year period. We are about four to five years from that now. We would like to be considered part of your community.

With there being no further comments or questions, Mayor Davidson closed the public hearing.

**B. Consideration of Ordinance to Extend the Corporate Limits of the Town of Weddington, North Carolina – New Town Market Annexation.** Mayor Pro Tem Barry moved to approve the petition for voluntary annexation request for New Town Market subject to the appropriate 60-day notice being provided to Marvin, Stallings and Charlotte as required in the annexation agreement and the effective date to be May 31, 2012. I challenge the audience to download the County's 2025 Land Use Plan. This entire area is subject to the County's zoning requirements and is zoned to be a commercial district the size of Cureton. One of the annexation objectives we had at the time was to begin to influence the development at that corner based on Weddington's M-X zoning versus the County's far more lenient zoning.

Councilmember Thomisser - My concern is the Planning Board's concern that this is a nonconforming commercial development. This is all about the serving of alcohol. I would support a sit down restaurant. This is one of the things Weddington wants. We had an opportunity to do that at the last Council meeting about a mile up the road; not only did we have an opportunity for a YMCA, land for a library and an opportunity to have restaurants but that was not what the Council was looking for at this particular time.

The vote on the motion is as follows:

AYES: Councilmember Hadley and Mayor Pro Tem Barry  
NAYS: Councilmembers Thomisser and Harrison

Mayor Davidson - We had a situation last year with the Spittle and Matthews properties. What happened with those properties? The reason it was changed was because it was next to commercial.

Town Planner Cook – The Land Use Plan was changed with those properties and they wanted future commercial.

Mayor Davidson - If we do this could that same argument be made for the adjacent properties because it is next to commercial?

Mayor Pro Tem Barry - According to our attorney, we have not set a precedent.

Attorney Fox - The reality is that a precedent does not bind this Council from future action. It does not require you or restrict you of your power.

Town Planner Cook - That property is currently designated business in our Land Use Plan. Those adjacent property owners have been beside business since 2002.

Mayor Davidson voted against the motion; therefore, the motion failed. Mayor Davidson cited that he was taking the advice of the Planning Board.

**C. Public Hearing to Review Luminous/Lighted Signs Text Amendment.** Mayor Davidson opened the public hearing to review the luminous/lighted signs text amendment. Town Planner Cook reviewed the proposed amendment with the Town Council:

**Sec. 58-146. - Prohibited signs.**

The following signs are expressly prohibited within all zoning districts, unless as otherwise specified in this chapter:

- (1) All off-premises signs, including directional signs and billboards. Such prohibition, however, shall not be applicable to temporary signs permitted by section 58-151
- (2) All portable signs, except as may otherwise be allowed by this chapter.
- (3) Flashing light signs (~~except signs which give time and temperature and other public information messages~~).
- (4) Any sign which the zoning administrator determines obstructs the view of bicyclists or motorists using any street, private driveway, approach to any street intersection, or which interferes with the effectiveness of or obscures any traffic sign, device or signal.
- (5) Luminous signs.
- (6) Any sign placed upon a traffic control sign, tree, or utility pole for any reason whatsoever.

**Sec. 58-147. - General requirements.**

- (a) Any lighted sign or lighting device shall be so oriented as not to cast light upon a public right-of-way so as to cause glare, intensity or reflection that may constitute a traffic hazard or a nuisance, or cast light upon adjacent property that may constitute a nuisance.
- (b) Lighted signs shall employ only devices emitting a light of constant intensity **and white color**, and no signs shall be illuminated by a flashing, intermittent, rotating or moving light.
- (c) No electric sign shall be so located with relation to pedestrian traffic as to permit such sign to be easily reached by any person. The bottom of such sign shall be located a minimum of ten feet above the grade immediately under said sign, if the sign is within 15 feet of the edge of the street right-of-way.
- (d) The area of a sign shall be measured by measuring one face of the entire sign including any border or trim and all of the elements of the matter displayed, but not including the base or apron, supports or other structural members. The area of a double face sign shall be the area of one face of the sign.
- (e) Nonconforming signs shall be subject to the provisions contained in section 58-112
- (f) Fencing, scoreboards, and structures in the athletic fields may be utilized for customary signs, and all such signs shall be directed solely towards users of the facility. Such individual signs, whether temporary or permanent, shall not exceed 32 square feet in size and shall be permitted by the zoning administrator in the manner of other permanent, attached (on-structure) signs under section 58-148, or temporary signs under section 58-151, without amendment to the conditional use permit or conditional zoning permit so long as compliance with all standards in this chapter are met

No one wished to speak in favor or against; therefore, Mayor Davidson closed the public hearing.

**D. Consideration of Ordinance to Adopt Luminous/Lighted Signs Text Amendment.** Councilwoman Harrison moved to adopt Ordinance O-2012-03:

**AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTIONS 58-146 AND 58-147  
OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES  
OF THE TOWN OF WEDDINGTON  
O-2012-03**

**BE IT ORDAINED BY THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF WEDDINGTON THAT SECTIONS 58-146 AND 58-147 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:**

**Sec. 58-146. - Prohibited signs.**

The following signs are expressly prohibited within all zoning districts, unless as otherwise specified in this chapter:

- (1) All off-premises signs, including directional signs and billboards. Such prohibition, however, shall not be applicable to temporary signs permitted by section 58-151
- (2) All portable signs, except as may otherwise be allowed by this chapter.
- (3) Flashing light signs (~~except signs which give time and temperature and other public information messages~~).
- (4) Any sign which the zoning administrator determines obstructs the view of bicyclists or motorists using any street, private driveway, approach to any street intersection, or which interferes with the effectiveness of or obscures any traffic sign, device or signal.
- (5) Luminous signs.
- (6) Any sign placed upon a traffic control sign, tree, or utility pole for any reason whatsoever.

**Sec. 58-147. - General requirements.**

- (a) Any lighted sign or lighting device shall be so oriented as not to cast light upon a public right-of-way so as to cause glare, intensity or reflection that may constitute a traffic hazard or a nuisance, or cast light upon adjacent property that may constitute a nuisance.
- (b) Lighted signs shall employ only devices emitting a light of constant intensity **and white color**, and no signs shall be illuminated by a flashing, intermittent, rotating or moving light.
- (c) No electric sign shall be so located with relation to pedestrian traffic as to permit such sign to be easily reached by any person. The bottom of such sign shall be located a minimum of ten feet above the grade immediately under said sign, if the sign is within 15 feet of the edge of the street right-of-way.
- (d) The area of a sign shall be measured by measuring one face of the entire sign including any border or trim and all of the elements of the matter displayed, but not including the base or apron, supports or other structural members. The area of a double face sign shall be the area of one face of the sign.
- (e) Nonconforming signs shall be subject to the provisions contained in section 58-112
- (f) Fencing, scoreboards, and structures in the athletic fields may be utilized for customary signs, and all such signs shall be directed solely towards users of the facility. Such individual signs, whether temporary or permanent, shall not exceed 32 square feet in size and shall be permitted by the zoning administrator in the manner of other permanent, attached (on-structure) signs under section 58-148, or temporary signs under section 58-151, without amendment to the conditional use permit or conditional zoning permit so long as compliance with all standards in this chapter are met

Adopted this 12<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2012.

All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

AYES: Councilmembers Thomisser, Hadley, Harrison and Mayor Pro Tem Barry  
NAYS: None

**E. Public Hearing to Review Freestanding Ground Signs Height Text Amendment.** Mayor Davidson opened the public hearing to review the freestanding ground signs height text amendment. Town Planner Cook reviewed the amendment with the Town Council:

**Sec. 58-149. - Freestanding ground signs.**

- (a) No **portion of any** freestanding ground sign shall be higher than 7 feet above grade as measured to the top of the sign.
- (b) No part of the sign including projections shall be located closer than 15 feet to any adjacent side lot line and shall not be located within five feet of the edge of the street right-of-way line.
- (c) All freestanding ground sign structures or poles shall be self-supporting structures erected on or set into and permanently attached to concrete foundations. Such structures or poles shall comply with the building codes of Union County and be affixed as not to create a public safety hazard.
- (d) The sign shall be located in a manner that does not impair traffic visibility.
- (e) Freestanding ground signs are permitted as long as the building or structure in which the activity is conducted is set back at least 30 feet from the street right-of-way.
- (f) The maximum sign area varies by type and use. Unless otherwise specified in the Ordinance, the maximum total sign area per side shall be 50 square feet and the total text area per side (including logos) shall be no greater than 20 square feet.

With there being no one wishing to speak regarding the text amendment, Mayor Davidson closed the public hearing.

**F. Consideration of Ordinance to Adopt Freestanding Ground Signs Height Text Amendment.** Councilwoman Hadley moved to adopt Ordinance O-2012-04:

**AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTION 58-149  
OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES  
OF THE TOWN OF WEDDINGTON  
O-2012-04**

**BE IT ORDAINED BY THE TOWN COUNCIL OF THE TOWN OF WEDDINGTON THAT SECTION 58-149 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:**

**Sec. 58-149. - Freestanding ground signs.**

- (a) No **portion of any** freestanding ground sign shall be higher than 7 feet above grade as measured to the top of the sign.
- (b) No part of the sign including projections shall be located closer than 15 feet to any adjacent side lot line and shall not be located within five feet of the edge of the street right-of-way line.
- (c) All freestanding ground sign structures or poles shall be self-supporting structures erected on or set into and permanently attached to concrete foundations. Such structures or poles shall comply with the building codes of Union County and be affixed as not to create a public safety hazard.
- (d) The sign shall be located in a manner that does not impair traffic visibility.
- (e) Freestanding ground signs are permitted as long as the building or structure in which the activity is conducted is set back at least 30 feet from the street right-of-way.

- (f) The maximum sign area varies by type and use. Unless otherwise specified in the Ordinance, the maximum total sign area per side shall be 50 square feet and the total text area per side (including logos) shall be no greater than 20 square feet.

Adopted this 12<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2012.

All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

AYES: Councilmembers Thomisser, Hadley, Harrison and Mayor Pro Tem Barry  
NAYS: None

Council took a brief recess.

**Item No. 9. Old Business.**

**A. Discussion and Possible Consideration of Fire Service in the Town of Weddington.** Mayor Davidson – At the last Town Council meeting, we were told to go forward with investigating the Municipal Fire District. We had presentations from two different sides tonight. I talked with Kara Millonzi from the School of Government and the Town cannot create a Municipal Fire District. What we are allowed to do is municipal fire service. We have the authority to pull out of the fire districts that currently exist. The County would stop pulling the fire tax and fire fee from those houses. Then the Town has the authority to increase its general tax rate to cover the costs for fire service and make contracts with the provider for fire services.

Councilwoman Hadley - I think we have heard from both sides. I would like to assure everyone that we have been doing our due diligence and we have been involved. I have been peeling back the layers since last July. Having heard the two opposing sides, I think it is now time for the Town Council to put together what we know and what we have been working so hard on. I would like to see our Mayor put together bullet points on what we have found out and the direction we intend on going and put that information out to give to the people that think we are not doing our due diligence.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry - At one time we discussed having a public forum. Is that what you are talking about?

Councilwoman Harrison - We have had our public forum and that is what we have done tonight. I am disappointed that there are people who think we have not done our job. I have read that fire study twice. I talked with seven fire chiefs and went to six stations and I have spent hours.

Councilmember Thomisser - It is my understanding that the Union County Fire Commission has intentions to have a public forum at Weddington High School to do exactly what you were talking about.

Councilwoman Harrison - I cannot force anyone to merge. What clout does the Fire Commission have? Can the fire commission force a merger? What new information are we going to be told?

Councilmember Thomisser - This is evolving. I feel that there is still more information to come. I have talked with the folks at Wesley Chapel VFD and they have said 3.2 cents is what it would take. I still do not have a tax number from Providence. I still do not know what the tax implications are if we went to a municipal fire department and that troubles me.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry - Let me jump on that grenade. Two years ago I ran for the Weddington Town Council. The reality is at the end of the day elections have consequences. We are elected to lead. There is an absolute abject failure whether it is in the Town Hall or in Town Halls all over the country, county

courthouses and you can take it the rest of the way to Washington, DC for people to stand up and be accountable. I took the time today to run the math to get you your answer and played worst case scenario and it is 6 cents. That is 8 basis points more than you pay today if you are in the Wesley Chapel district and live in the Town of Weddington. On a \$400,000 house that is \$32.00. That means that this Town Council has been distracted for 14 months because the County Commission refuses to deal with this to talk about \$32.00. I think everybody in this room can agree that in the hundreds of thousands of dollars that we spend in time, and legal work, combined with the other resources we have allocated to that it is \$32.00. At the end of the day for a year every time I pick up the phone with somebody I go back to the conversation that I had when I flew back from a meeting in Washington, DC for the first merger discussions that happened in this room. I said, "Look guys, all I want to know is that you have three fire stations with apparatus and volunteers and you have 12,000 people that do not care as long as when they dial 911 a truck shows up – just figure it out." Well those two groups of people could not figure it out. The Town Council went back to the County Commission repeatedly to ask for their help and did not receive direction from the County any where on this. All of a sudden the municipal government says we are going to stand up and take control of the situation and the County Commission says, "Oh, no we want the ball back now." You forfeited the right. It is time for us to move on. I got the numbers and we are not going to get into it tonight. If you throw in the 2.2 cents on top of the 3 cents, we already collect in property taxes, we can pay the fees and it does not include the capital. I talked with Jack Parks today to talk about what it will cost to renovate or add on to that building and amortize it over 20 or 30 years at 5%. It is a nominal increase to the tax rate - 8 basis points - \$32.00. This goes away for \$32.00. With all due respect for the former State house member and talking about that \$32.00 is going to break the bank from somebody living in unincorporated Union County when we create a municipal fire district that is somebody else's problem. My problem is the 12,000 people that elected me or the 600 of the 12,000 that actually voted. As Greg Wyant said when he lost the race – I have a responsibility and obligation to represent all of those 12,000 people and all of their interests and I am going to make a lot of people mad tonight because I am not supportive of the merger because it is time for all of us together to recognize that we have to drill out the solution because the folks that were elected have failed to do it. The Town rates are currently being collected by the County through a variety of boards or fees from those boards and they are not subject to the public. I stand for election every four years. The majority of this board stands for election every two years on a rotating basis. You have the ability to cast a ballot and take control over the Town Council and set the direction and the tax policy of this Town. We have no ability to control what happens in your volunteer fire departments and I will debate that. I am a member of the Wesley Chapel District. I have never been notified as to when their meetings are and when they decided to build the new fire department I do not recall ever receiving communication about the fire department being built and being able to participate as a participant of the district in voting for my tax dollars to be used in that way. You as a citizen every other November get to go to the poles and decide how your tax policy in the Town is going to be determined and that is why I am making the decision that I make.

Mayor Davidson – You are suggesting the meeting tonight being our public forum. We had this mailer that went out. The presentation had a different tone than the mailer. This mailer is meant to get people out and active. They probably got the same yield as we did during the campaign. It is sort of frustrating. It says why you should support a merger and why you should oppose a municipal fire district. That is slanted in one way. At the bottom for the merger it says the estimated tax increase is negligible. It says the estimated tax increase for the municipal is unlimited. I can tell you that I can write something too and send it to everyone in Weddington and I can generate interest too. That is what I would like to do. We have been doing a lot of research. Werner wants a number and the public wants a number. What this thing is saying is I am scared of a horrible tax increase. How many of you showed up in 2008? There was a revaluation on the properties. The Town had a 3 cent tax rate. After the revaluation they could have done a revenue neutral rate of 1.9 cents. They did not. They kept it at 3 cents. That tax increase already took place and you never came. I would like to communicate with the public and we talked about a letter. How many newsletters do we have left to do? We could not do a newsletter format. Take the money that

we budgeted with that and do some type of communication with the public. I think this is more important than the newsletter. I want to go to the church at our next meeting and have this on the agenda as Discussion and Possible Consideration of Municipal Fire Service and let's talk about both sides and put the letter out before the next meeting.

Councilmember Thomisser – There is no question that fire service and medical services are important. I ran on a platform two years ago and I said that I would not raise taxes. Now all of a sudden this fire thing has been cast upon us and what I am trying to do is to have the best possible fire and medical service and coverage at the most cost effective price. I shudder when I see in the Charlotte Observer on January 9 the towns of Cornelius, Davidson, Huntersville and Mint Hill – Mecklenburg County said that they are not going to subsidize these municipalities any more. They are going to make a decision by July 1 on what the tax will be and in the case of Cornelius it could be 4 ½ cents, Davidson could be 4 ½ cents, Huntersville could be 5 cents and Mint Hill could be 7 cents. We are already paying 3 cents property tax and do you want to add another 4 ½ cents to that or another 7 cents to that? I cannot justify that based on what I told the voters when I ran for office.

Councilwoman Harrison - I am not hearing those types of numbers. We have spent a lot of time looking at things. The only thing I think those fire stations had in common was they have paid full-time part-time firefighters during the day. Every one of them runs their station differently and not one would I say has a fault. I have seen men sleep on the floor and men who have a nice bed. I have seen where volunteers are paid something and some are paid nothing. When we talk about public safety that is what I am talking about. I want the best public safety that we can have. If it costs a little bit more - it costs a little bit more. Werner, you also ran that you would do no more new commercial yet you voted for 200 acres to go to commercial. I am not saying raise the tax rate to 10 cents. I think we have all looked at the numbers and know what we can live with. We will come up with something that we can make work for this Town and have the best service for this Town.

Councilmember Thomisser – We had an opportunity to bring a full service YMCA to Weddington which I felt was a quality of life issue. We had an opportunity to get land for a library. Close to 70% of people in Weddington said that they wanted a library. We had an opportunity get a park and walking trails for Weddington. You have to weigh that against what you are going to give up.

Councilwoman Hadley - I would not blink at going from 5.2 cents to 6 cents because of exactly just that. I do not want to give up 24/7 coverage and I would like to see Weddington come together for Weddington. I make a motion to have our Mayor put together a brochure/letter of information to share with the public and to put it together in a concise way to share.

Councilmember Thomisser – I think that is not a bad idea but I would like to do that after the meeting at the high school by the Fire Commission. These are the experts.

Mayor Pro Tem Barry volunteered to help Mayor Davidson with the letter.

The vote on the motion is as follows:

AYES:	Councilmembers Hadley and Harrison and Mayor Pro Tem Barry
NAYS:	Councilmember Thomisser

The next Town Council Meeting will be held April 2 at 6:00 p.m. at the Weddington United Methodist Church.

**Item No. 10. New Business.**

**A. Preliminary Discussions Regarding Fiscal Year 2012-2013 Budget.** Finance Officer Leslie Gaylord reviewed the proposed budget with the Town Council. She stated, “If anyone wants different budget scenarios based on discussions that we have had tonight, I can prepare them. If you have any non-recurring one-time line items you would like to be included in the budget, we can add to the sheet. We will also have a budget training session at the retreat.”

**Item No. 11. Update from Town Planner.** The Town Council received the following update from Town Planner Cook:

- Construction of the NC 84 Weddington-Matthews Road Dual Lane Roundabout should begin this summer. NCDOT plans to begin construction as soon as schools are out. The Town will pay \$9,000 for conduit for irrigation and/or lighting and fill dirt in the roundabout. Sidewalks along Weddington Road, upgraded crosswalks and sign posts will not be upgraded by the Town. NCDOT has agreed to install dark (almost black) tint to the inside of the circle and a terra cotta color tint for the larger islands leading into and out of the circle.
- NCDOT plans to start construction of the Weddington Church Road relocation in March. All environmental permits have been approved and the construction contract will soon be awarded.
- The Town has received a petition for voluntary annexation of 6.177 acres located at the northwest corner of Providence Road and New Town Road. This area includes three commercial parcels with existing commercial uses. The Planning Board gave this annexation a unanimous unfavorable recommendation for a myriad of reason highlighted in a separate memo.
- At their February 13<sup>th</sup> meeting the Town Council approved \$35,000 for additional median landscaping along Providence Road, Hemby Road and Rea Road. Councilman Thomisser, Councilwoman Harrison and I met with Union County Urban Forester David Grant on February 22<sup>nd</sup> to develop a plan. David Grant is currently working on a plan and would like to have the plants in the ground by May 15<sup>th</sup> at the latest.
- The following text amendments were on the February 27<sup>th</sup> Planning Board agenda. These text amendments may be on the April Town Council agenda. Town staff wishes to discuss these with the Town Attorney before proceeding.
  - Agritourism Definition
  - Agricultural Uses Definition
- The following items may be on the March 26<sup>th</sup> Planning Board agenda for discussion:
  - Shopping Center Signs Text Amendment
  - Produce Stand Definition
  - Farmers Market Definition
  - Any items discussed at the March 23<sup>rd</sup> Planning Retreat

**Item No. 12. Update from Town Administrator/Clerk.** The Town Council received the following update from Town Administrator/Clerk Amy McCollum:

The Weddington 2<sup>nd</sup> Annual Easter Egg Hunt will be held March 31, 2012 from 2 to 4 p.m. here at the Town Hall. The rain date is April 1, 2012. Councilwoman Barbara Harrison and several members of the Parks and Recreation Advisory Board have worked to receive numerous sponsors for this event.

We should receive copies of the 2012 Welcome Magazine by the end of the month.

The next Historic Tea is scheduled for May.

A Weddington Facebook page has been set up for the Town.

We are working on a letter to be sent to the USPS requesting a Weddington Zip Code.



The Weddington Spring Litter Sweep will be held April 21, 2012 at 9:00 a.m. here at the Town Hall.

Upcoming Meeting Dates:

- March 23, 2012 - Retreat at Firethorne Country Club beginning at 8:30 a.m.  
Meet and Greet Reception Immediately Following Retreat
- March 26, 2012 - Planning Board Meeting
- March 29, 2012 - Special Parks and Recreation Advisory Board Meeting
- April 2, 2012 - Regular Town Council Meeting beginning at 6:00 p.m. (Moved from April 9)
- April 3, 2012 - Public Safety Advisory Board Meeting
- April 6, 2012 - Closed for Good Friday

**Item No. 13. Public Safety Report.**

Weddington Deputies – 672

Providence VFD - The Town Council received the Income and Expense Budget Performance and Balance Sheet for February 2012.

**Item No. 14. Update from Finance Officer and Tax Collector.**

**A. Finance Officer’s Report.** The Town Council received the Revenue and Expenditure Statement and Balance Sheet for 2/1/12 to 2/29/12.

**B. Tax Collector’s Report.**

**Monthly Report – February 2012**

<b>Transactions:</b>	
<\$5.00 Adjustments	\$(116.53)
2011 Interest Charges	\$348.24
Penalty and Interest Payments	\$(565.36)
Refunds	\$264.74
Releases	\$(1,545.29)
Overpayments	\$(104.62)
<b>Taxes Collected:</b>	
2011	\$(17,346.52)
2010	\$(608.86)
2009	\$(383.09)
2008	\$(376.27)
<b>As of February 29, 2012; the following taxes remain Outstanding:</b>	
2002	\$82.07
2003	\$160.16
2004	\$159.59
2005	\$291.65
2006	\$180.70

2007	\$200.32
2008	\$2,517.65
2009	\$3,291.45
2010	\$5,674.59
2011	\$28,366.54
<b>Total Outstanding:</b>	<b>\$40,924.72</b>

**Item No. 15. Transportation Report.** There was not a Transportation Report.

**Item No. 16. Council Comments.** There were no Council Comments.

**Item No. 17. Adjournment.** Councilwoman Harrison moved to adjourn the March 12, 2012 Regular Town Council Meeting. All were in favor, with votes recorded as follows:

AYES: Councilmembers Thomisser, Hadley, Harrison and Mayor Pro Tem Barry  
 NAYS: None

The meeting ended at 10:09 p.m.

---

Walker F. Davidson, Mayor

---

Amy S. McCollum, Town Clerk