FEBRUARY 21, 2022

The Mayor and City Council of the City of Goldsboro, North Carolina, held their Annual Retreat on Monday, February 21, 2022 at the Goldsboro Event Center, 1501 South Slocumb Street, Goldsboro, North Carolina with attendance as follows:

Present: Mayor David Ham, Presiding
Mayor Pro Tem Taj Polack
Councilwoman Hiawatha Jones
Councilman Bill Broadaway (arrived at 9:30)
Councilwoman Brandi Matthews
Councilman Charles Gaylord, IV
Councilman Gene Aycock

Others Present: Tim Salmon, City Manager
Laura Getz, City Clerk
Ron Lawrence, City Attorney
Roe O'Donnell, Temporary Assistant City Manager
Octavius Murphy, Assistant to the City Manager
Holly Jones, Deputy City Clerk
Kenny Talton, Planning Director
Jeff Cooke, GIS Specialist
Mike West, Police Chief
Scott Williams, Information Technology Director
Felicia Brown, Parks and Recreation Director
Bert Sherman, Interim Public Utilities Director
Rick Fletcher, Public Works Director
Ron Stempien, Fire Chief
Allen Anderson, Chief Building Inspector
Felecia Williams, Community Relations Director
Bobby Croom, Engineering Director
Adam Twiss, Paramount Theatre Director
Brad Hinnant, Assistant Information Technology Director
Erin Fonseca, Downtown Development Director
Scott Satterfield, Business & Property Development Specialist
Metra Sheshbaradaran, Downtown Goldsboro Intern

Call to Order. Mayor Ham called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

Adoption of the Agenda. City Manager Tim Salmon requested to add a discussion to end the mask mandate to the agenda. Council and the manager discussed the issue of mask mandates. Mayor Pro Tem Polack made a motion to keep the current policy which requires that individuals within six feet of another one will wear a mask. Councilwoman Matthews seconded the motion. Mayor Ham, Mayor Pro Tem Polack, Councilmembers Jones, Matthews and Gaylord voted for the motion. Councilman Aycock voted against the motion. The motion passed. Councilmember Gaylord made a motion to approve the agenda as amended. The motion was seconded by Councilwoman Jones and unanimously carried.

Mayors Comments. Mayor Ham shared the following presentation:

Purpose: To address issues effecting the Growth of Goldsboro, Services to our Citizens and Improvement of their Quality of Life.

What impacts these issues?

Growth of Goldsboro:
• Major growth in counties to our west – Wake, Harnett, Johnston (Johnston fastest growing in NC).
• Increased residential construction in west and northwest areas of Goldsboro/Wayne County.
• New industry growth since 2015 and still more to come.
• How do we prepare and support this anticipated Growth?
Infrastructure:
- Utilities - Look seriously at development of a clear plan to prioritize and fund the needed repairs and expansion of our water and sewer capabilities to serve current and future requirements.

Other:
- Revenue to the City (Property/Sales Taxes, Utility Rates/Other).
- High Standards of Services to our Citizens.
- Affordable Housing.
- Jobs.

**Economic Development.** (Mark Pope, WCDA President; Berry Gray, WC Planning Director; Kenny Talton, CoG Planning Director)

Mark Pope, Wayne County Development Alliance President shared the following presentation:
Council discussed housing, quality of life, and education with Mr. Pope.

Berry Gray, Wayne County Planning Director shared the following presentation:

Wayne County Development Trends

Census 2020

- Wayne County Population
  - 117,333: loss of 8,290
- Goldsboro
  - 33,657: loss of 2,780
- Mount Olive
  - 6,199: loss of 431
- Farmwood
  - 4,194: loss of 99
- Seven Springs
  - 155: loss of 110
- Pineville
  - 712: increase of 34
- Coates
  - 214: increase of 17
- 3,289 decrease for municipalities and 2,001 for unincorporated areas.
- 1st time since 1790 that Wayne County as a whole lost population.

Census 2020

- 2010 to 2020 - Census shows 480 less housing units in Wayne County:
  - 2010 to 2020 - 2,600 units were constructed:
  - Does not include mobile/manufactured housing.
  - Estimated loss of 2,800 housing units.
  - NC Census Count Question Resolution:
    - incorrect boundary
    - units counted in wrong location
    - units not counted at all

Kenny Talton, Planning Director shared the following presentation:
Goldsboro Land-Use Trends

- Commercial development activity has increased along 70 West.
- Strong indications that commercial development activity will increase along the new Hwy 70 corridor, specifically at 70/581, 70/117N and 70/Wayne Memorial Dr.
- Increase in new single-family and multi-family developments (i.e. Magnolia Grove, Adair Place, Tiffany Gardens).
- Strong indications that multi-family developments will increase to meet current housing demands for the area.
- Strong indications that existing and new industrial business parks will see an increase in development activity.

Mayor Ham shared that he asked for these presentations to show that Goldsboro is changing and growing and we need to be prepared to provide the facilities, the infrastructure, and other services.

Public Utilities Presentation. Bert Sherman, Interim Public Utilities Director shared the following presentation:
FY21-22/22-23 CIP (ARPA Funds)

Public Utilities Projects
Bert Sherman, WRF Superintendent/Public Utilities Interim Director
February 21st and 22nd, 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Plant Crack Structures</td>
<td>Cost TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Reclamation Facility FY23</td>
<td>$240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Reclamation Facility (WRF)</td>
<td>14.2 MGD Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Tank Painting and Maintenance</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Neuse River Dredging</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Treatment Plant Feasibility Study</td>
<td>*$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,654,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Major Capital Projects

Water Plant Crack Structures

Report of Structural Cracks at the WRF
An engineering contract to the amount of $20,000 to evaluate the security of the cracking and excavation conditions with automated tools in pending Council approval.

2021 WRF's Percentile and Actual Flows are at 88% of Capacity

Water Reclamation Facility FY23

Replace WRF Bench Press #1
10% or 15% of each referee's (or 20% of each referee's) recommended advice if the system is not efficient.

Replace Bench Filter Media in One Side Filter
Water Reclamation Facility

Compost Facility

$405,000.00
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Stantec Rate Study December 2021

Other Water Distribution and Wastewater Collection Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water system draft feasibility analysis (plus)</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water system design revisions and expansion work</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water system installation revisions and expansion work</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water system installation revisions and expansion work (2nd phase)</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021 Water system installations (total 8,000)</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021 Water system installation (4TF water treatment plant, 4TF WWTP)</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022 Water system installation (4TF water treatment plant)</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022 Water system installation (4TF WWTP)</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$117,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Projected Operating and Capital Expenditures -
Extracted from Stantec Rate Study (5 Million)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2022</th>
<th>FY 2023</th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
<th>FY 2026</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$24,941</td>
<td>$24,941</td>
<td>$24,941</td>
<td>$24,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue &amp; Capital Rate</td>
<td>$11,174</td>
<td>$11,174</td>
<td>$11,174</td>
<td>$11,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$13,767</td>
<td>$13,767</td>
<td>$13,767</td>
<td>$13,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>$11,767</td>
<td>$11,767</td>
<td>$11,767</td>
<td>$11,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$25,534</td>
<td>$25,534</td>
<td>$25,534</td>
<td>$25,534</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5-Year Revenue Sufficiency Full Capital Plan - Forecast Increases

(Edited From Stantec Rate Study)

Operating Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2023</th>
<th>FY 2024</th>
<th>FY 2025</th>
<th>FY 2026</th>
<th>FY 2027</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$24,941</td>
<td>$24,941</td>
<td>$24,941</td>
<td>$24,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue &amp; Capital Rate</td>
<td>$11,174</td>
<td>$11,174</td>
<td>$11,174</td>
<td>$11,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$13,767</td>
<td>$13,767</td>
<td>$13,767</td>
<td>$13,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Expenditures</td>
<td>$11,767</td>
<td>$11,767</td>
<td>$11,767</td>
<td>$11,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$25,534</td>
<td>$25,534</td>
<td>$25,534</td>
<td>$25,534</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions?

GOLDSBOR
BE MORE DO MORE SEYMOUR
Public Utilities

Council discussed the issues with equipment at the plants and funding through the American Rescue Plan. Mr. Sherman shared with Council that we have to do something to address the Inflow and Infiltration (I & I) issues. Mr. Roe O’Donnell, Temporary Assistant City Manager shared information concerning I & I studies. He also shared information regarding the rate study by Stantec completed in December 2021. Bobby Croom, Engineering Director shared information regarding other water distribution and wastewater collection projects. Mr. O’Donnell shared that Council has to raise the rates or you will be in serious debt later on.

The meeting recessed at 10:46 a.m. and council members divided into groups and toured the Water Treatment Plant and Water Reclamation Facility with the exception of Councilman Broadway and Councilman Aycock. Mayor Ham toured the facilities on Friday, February 18, 2022.

The meeting reconvened at 1:00 p.m.
Road Construction Update. Jennifer Collins with the NC Department of Transportation shared the following presentation:

Wayne County Projects

U-2714 – Widen and Improve US 117 (N. Williams St.)
Contract Amount: $15,300,000
Awarded: March 2020
Construction: J. Smith Civil, LLC
Status: 50% complete
Construction started October 5, 2020

Division 4 – Wayne County - Project Updates

- William Street – Currently Under Construction
  Phase 1 is expected to be completed in early spring. The start of phase 2 will be a major
  project in 2020.
  50% complete per funding.
- US 13 Roundabout Management
  Currently in the design engineering phase, the process is moving along.
  End result – design phase, approval of the plan.
- Wayne Memorial Ball Ducts
  Accessible 500 feet at Lockwood Drive and Country Club Road
  The plan is to design, build, and be signed off so we can move utilities. 
  Estimated completion date: mid-
- Central Height Realignment
  On schedule to be in place in November.
- Pavement Rehab on US 117 from US 70 to Duplin County

2024-2033 STIP Development Update

P6.0 Funding Availability Before IIJA – Committed Projects Only

P6.0 Funding Availability After IIJA – Committed Projects Only

Available funding based on 2024-2033 timeframe

Status of the Three Main Decisions for Developing 2024-2033 STIP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Point One: Overall Method</th>
<th>Workgroup Consensus</th>
<th>IIJT Consensus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Comprehensive recommendations for state, local STP Development Districts</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Point Two: Scenario Method for Selecting Delivery Projects</th>
<th>Workgroup Consensus</th>
<th>IIJT Consensus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Delivery Project selection using Scenario 2 approach - existing P-13P-20 on basis of budget, project, and MBI</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Point Three: Project Selection Method</th>
<th>Workgroup Consensus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. P-13P-20 Approach with Flexibility (allows for new schedules or projects)</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Selection Method

* Use "Programming F3-P4-P5" Approach with Flexibility
  * Start with projects committed for P3-P5 and select projects by highest score (streamlining order)
  * Bring projects to cost limited funding curve
  * If funding remains available, repeat process for projects committed in P3-P4, then P5
  * Flexibility opportunities for funded projects (swaps)

Workgroup Recommendation

- Use "Programming F3-P4-P5" Approach with Flexibility

Project Prioritization Status

Where to draw the line on projects subject to prioritization?

Options discussed:

A. Scenarios 2 projects exempt from prioritization
B. 5-year Info. ROW and/or CON dates by FY2028 or sooner = Workgroup Recommendation
C. 6-year Info. ROW and/or CON dates by FY2029 or sooner
D. Combination of Option-A/B or Option-A/C
E. Percentage of funding exempt from prioritization

Wayne County Projects

**U-39098 – Widens & Improves US 13 (Berkeley Blvd.)**

Description: Widens & Improves US 13 from New Hope Rd. to Saturn Rd.

Status: Right of way acquisition underway

Let Date: July 2024

**Wayne County Projects**

**U-4753 – Widens Wayne Memorial Dr.**

Description: Widens Wayne Memorial Dr. from New Hope Rd. to US 70 Bypass

Construction Est.: $12,490,000

Let Date: March 2022

Wayne County Projects

Status of Goldsboro MPO Projects within the 2024 – 2033 STP development

- Projects Competing – Statewide Tier (29%) – $2.64B:
  - 1032457: 15% from NC 101 to NC 500 from NC 101 to NC 500
  - 1052555: 15% from NC 101 to NC 500
  - 1032513: 15% from NC 101 to NC 500

Future I-42

US 70 corridor between I-40 in Raleigh to Mebane NC City

Flexibility Option

NCDOT will allow flexibility once Preliminary Draft 2024-2033 STP is programmed

- Project schedules can be swapped
- Projects that aren’t selected for funding can be swapped with projects selected for funding
- Schedules of projects swapped in may be different than schedules of projects swapped out

Parameters:

1. All swaps must be agreed to by NCDOT and all affected MPOs (or in which the project is located)
2. Cost of project(s) swapped in must be less than 115% of cost of project(s) being swapped out
3. Swaps should generally occur within same STI funding category
4. Swaps between modes allowed as long as normalization percentages are still met
5. Justification for any swap must be documented, which will be made public

Status of Goldsboro MPO Projects within the 2024 – 2033 STP development

- Delivery Status:
  - U-36990A - US 13 from New Hope Rd. to Saturn Rd.
  - U-39098 - US 13 from New Hope Rd. to Saturn Rd.
  - U-4753 - US 70 Bypass

Construction Date: April 2022

**Wayne County Projects**

**U-5724 – Align Central Heights Rd. with Royal Ave. & Construct Falls Blvd.**

Construction Est.: $14,405,000

Let Date: November 2022

Status: Right of Way acquisition substantially complete. Utility relocations underway.

TIP: R-5829A, R-5829B

US 70 upgrade to future I-42 in Princeton in Johnston Co. and Wayne Co.

Construction: R-5829A – FY 2027
R-5829B – FY 2029
Wayne County Future Interstate I-42

R-5829A – US 70 Upgrades from Princeton to Goldsboro Bypass

Capps Bridge Rd. & Ebenezer Church Rd. Interchange

Let: FY 2027
Estimate: $50 M

Wayne County Projects

U-4407 – Widens Ash St. from Berkeley Boulevard to US 70

Description: widen to six lanes in County’s Industrial Corridor.

Construction Est.: 330,000

Status: Concept Phase. Right of Way Acquisition to begin in 2021. Yet date not predetermined.

Wayne County Future Interstate I-42

TIP: R-2553

US 70 upgrade to future I-42 in Lenoir County.

Construction:
R-2551B – Beyond Years (R/W 2020)
R-2551C – Beyond Years (R/W 2025)

Status: Goldsboro-MP3 Projects within the 2024 – 2033 STIP Development

Projects Competing – Division Needs (580’s S308M) – Division 4:
- [Project Details]

Projects Competing – Division Needs (580’s S308M) – Division 4:
- [Project Details]

Next Steps

Begin developing Preliminary Draft 2020-2033 STIP

Develop messaging

Partner education spring 2022

Public involvement

STIP development meetings with MPOs & RPOs mid 2022

Interstate Expansion into Eastern NC

Future I-42
US 70 corridor between L-40 in Raleigh to Northeast NC

Future I-87
US 70 corridor from the US 64/50 split in Zebulon to Wilson to Greenville

TIP: W-5600

US 70 upgrade to future I-42 near Wilson’s Mills in Johnston Co.

Construction: March 2021
Mrs. Collins shared information on the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO), which includes Goldsboro, Walnut Creek, Pikeville and portions of Wayne County. Councilman Polack asked if bus canopies could be funded using the NCDOT funds discussed. Ms. Collins suggested the city work with Don Willis, GWTA Director.

Mrs. Collins shared information regarding an upcoming project, the Ash Street Corridor Study.

Department Head FY 22-23 Budget Items.

Ron Stempien, Fire Chief shared the following presentation:

State of the Department
FY21-22

To provide prompt, skilled and cost effective protection to life, property and the environment.

State of the Department

- TOTAL ASSIGNED PERSONNEL - 84 FTE's = 3 PTE's
  - 75 OPERATIONS
  - 9 STAFF/ ADMINISTRATION
  - 3 PTE (2 Inspectors, 1 Support Services, 1 Training)
  - 5 STATIONS
  - 6 APPARATUS (4 ENG, 2 QUAD, 1 RESCUE)
  - 3 RESERVE APPARATUS (2 ENG, 1 LADDER)
2021 Response Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CALLS</td>
<td>2781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure Fires</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS</td>
<td>1069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Accidents</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>1,235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes false alarms, water rescue, unlocking, vehicle fires, pedestrian aid

Fire Department Concerns

- STAFFING
- SALARIES
- APPARATUS

Concerns - Staffing

- SHORTAGE
  - 4 LOSE 8 EMPLOYEES SINCE DECEMBER 2021
  - 21 (19) SUPERVISOR POSITIONS, 2 (3) FROZEN POSITIONS
  - UP TO 20% REDUCTION IN SAFETY NECESSARY
  - 2 PART-TIME VACANCIES
  - 1 ADMINISTRATIVE VACANCY
- MINIMUM STAFFING
  - NFPA 1710 - 2020 STANDARD
  - LOW HAZARD - MINIMUM STAFFING 16 / 17 HOSPITAL (SINGLE FACILITY)
  - MEDIUM HAZARD - MINIMUM STAFFING 32 (3 STORY APARTMENT)
  - HIGH HAZARD - MINIMUM STAFFING 40 (HIGH RISE OVER 75)

Concerns - Salaries

- SALARIES ARE STAGNANT (employees at the same salary years later)
- EMPLOYEES LEAVING FOR BETTER PAY / REGULAR RAISES
- NO INCENTIVE PAY FOR DEGREES
- A PAY PLAN IS IMPERATIVE TO KEEP EMPLOYEES
  - COLA
  - MERIT

Concerns - Apparatus

- APPARATUS
  - ENGINE 1: 2010, 71  (4152, 4317, 181,795)
  - ENGINE 2: 2016, 22 (1492, 1655, 579,259)
  - ENGINE 3: 2019, 12 (858, 824, 299,949)
  - ENGINE 4: 2015, 10 (829, 783, 274,998)
  - ENGINE 5: 2016, 16 (1262, 1574, 579,148)
  - ENGINE 7: 2011, 35 (1862, 1036, 338,610)
  - ENGINE 8: 1990, 26 (1496, 451,299)
  - LADDER 1: 2015, 18 (278, 830, 180,170)

Concerns - Apparatus (cont.)

- LIFE CYCLING AIDS IN:
  - Minimizing overall fleet cost
  - Maximizing vehicle availability
  - Providing fleet users with safe and reliable tools to perform their jobs

Source: NFPA Vehicle Replacement Guide

Capital Improvement Plan

- Imperative for the health of the department
- Plan has been previously presented
- CIP will allow for replacement of all equipment
  - Facilities
  - Apparatus
  - Administrative Response Vehicles
  - Air Packs
  - Hose
  - Radios

- INSTALLATION OF CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN
  - REPLACEMENT OF E-2: 75' QUANT (IMMEDIATE)
  - REPLACEMENT OF ADMIN RESPONSE VEHICLE (IMMEDIATE)
  - REPLACEMENT OF ENGINE 7: 1 YEAR
  - REPLACEMENT OF FIRE STATION 3: 2-3 YEARS OR SOONER

Council discussed additional calls related to EMS, department vehicles, contracts with new employees, staffing and retention with Chief Stempień.
Mike West, Police Chief shared the following presentation:

**GOLDSBORO POLICE DEPARTMENT**

**108 Sworn Personnel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Service</th>
<th>Number of Officers/Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 years</td>
<td>15 - 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 10 but less than 20 years</td>
<td>28 - 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 5 but less than 10 years</td>
<td>16 - 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5 years</td>
<td>19 - 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>10 - 9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Part I Crimes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offense</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>% of Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homicide</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>+40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny</td>
<td>1656</td>
<td>1447</td>
<td>1465</td>
<td>1516</td>
<td>1548</td>
<td>+3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Theft</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>+3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL             | 3279 | 2962 | 2587 | 2479 | 2758 | -10%        |

**Criminal Investigations Division**

**Investigator Assignments**

- Crimes Against Persons - 1
- Arson - 1
- Burglary - 1
- Larceny - 2
- Financial Crime - 2
- Underwriting Fraud - 1
- DUI - 1
- ALF Task Force - 1

**Case Load Assignments**

- 134 Cases assigned to Property Crime Investigators
- 138 Cases assigned to Financial Crime Investigators
- 25 Cases assigned to Underwriting Fraud
- 25 Cases assigned to ALF Task Force
- 1 Case assigned to DUI

* A total of 353 Felony cases were assigned to 10 investigators in 2021. (Average of 35 cases per investigator)
  * 12.72% decrease from 2020

**TRAINING**
Training Hours
Officers of the Goldston Police Department received 146.2 hours of training in 2021. This training included 24 hours of training mandated by the NC Criminal Justice Education and Training Standards Commission for each sworn officer, along with other specialized training courses to enhance officer skills and knowledge as they continue to effectively serve the citizens of Goldston:

- Long-Term Effects of Childhood Adversity
- Rescue Task Force, (Follow-on to Rapid Deployment)
- The Signs Within: Suicide Prevention and Awareness
- Communication Strategies When Encountering Persons Who Are Deaf or Hard of Hearing

14% increase in Training Hours compared to 2020

POLICE VEHICLE INVENTORY

PATROL VEHICLES
60 TOTAL VEHICLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Age of Admin Vehicles</td>
<td>6.2 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADMIN VEHICLES
39 TOTAL VEHICLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Age of Admin Vehicles</td>
<td>9.5 yrs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY 22-23 Patrol/Admin Vehicle Request

- 2012 Ford Crown Victoria
- 2022 Dodge Charger

ACCREDITATION

- CALA (Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies)
  - November 2020 – Received the advanced Law Enforcement Accreditation Award
  - November 2021 – Successfully completed our 1st year of our 4 year accreditation cycle and collecting proofs of continued compliance
  - Completing Annual Reporting:
    - Calendar year evaluations and analyses
    - Revisions and updates to General Orders
    - Updating our Strategic Plan and Recruitment Plan for FY 2023-2024
  - Anticipate enrollment in the North Carolina Law Enforcement Accreditation program (NCLEA) in the spring/summer of 2022
  - Hosted the February business meeting for the North Carolina Law Enforcement Accreditation Network (NCLEAN), professional organization for the entire state

Council discussed Shotspotter, Day Circle (Grand at Day Point), Tsunami cameras and police officers at Wayne County School sporting events with Chief West.

Rick Fletcher, Public Works Director shared the following presentation:

Three Key Budget Items

- Funds for Operations
  - Insurance and supplies for daily operations
  - State, local, and federal reimbursements
  - Salaries for front line staff
- Funds for Replacement
  - New vehicles and field equipment: due to high demand
  - Equipment for new personnel
  - Ongoing challenges with field budgeting

Richard F. A. Fletcher III, Public Works Director
February 24, 2022
Council discussed the need for gutters being cleaned out and mentioned citing residents for putting pine straw in the gutters with Mr. Fletcher.

Felicia Brown, Parks and Recreation Director shared the following presentation:

**We Make Play Happen**
GOLDSBORO PARKS AND RECREATION
Parks & Recreation Personnel
- Parks and Recreation has 37 full-time authorized positions and 6 permanent part-time authorized positions
  - of the 37 FT positions, 4 are currently vacant
  - 5 of the 6 PPT positions are Custodians...
City Hall, City Hall Annex, Downtown Development, the HUB – all facilities we can clean in addition to our P&R facilities

T.C. Coley Community Center
- Operations and maintenance of facility given back to Parks and Recreation; annual budget did not increase
  - HVAC yearly contract is $7,313
  - Utility bills are +/- $7,000 for the year
- Staffing costs to maintain inside facility and grounds are $3,670 for the year
  - Additional costs are repair and/or replacement of HVAC units, repainting the roof, renovating the men’s and women’s restrooms, repainting the playground multi

Herman Park Tennis Courts
- Herman Park Tennis Courts were resurfaced in 2013 – same year we first hosted the USTA NC Singles Adult League State Championships
  - We’ve hosted this tournament, along with many others since 2017
- USTA tournament has had an economic impact of over $1M
  - Tennis Courts need to be resurfaced again – we have delayed the maintenance since 2019
  - Cost is estimated approximately $100k – 10 tennis courts

Downtown Streetscape
- Responsible for plantings on Center Street from Ash/Center to Elm/Center, including around art pieces
- Responsible for moving area around the HUB and cleaning the restrooms
- Six (6) mowers for mowing grass in our parks and greenways, including front lawn of Herman Park Center and TC Coley Community Center
  - One (1) new mower purchased during FY2021

Council discussed the T.C. Coley Community Center, Berkeley Boulevard and Center Street maintenance and volunteer hours. City Manager Salmon asked questions about the recreation program revenues with Mrs. Brown.

Scott Williams, Information Technology Director shared the following presentation:

General Update
- We are tracking under budget for the current FY.
- We expect to ask for less operational funds in the coming FY.
- Staffing is still a concern. We have filled 2 of the 3 recent positions with interview next week for the third. We’ve 2 vacancies that are proving more difficult to fill.
- Staff pay is an issue as we are having issues recruiting for our higher positions.
  - I believe the pay needs to be reviewed for Information Technology to ensure its competitive.
- All positions need to be assessed and any changes made that are appropriate.
- Vehicles have been an issue for IT for several years. We are making improvements, but still need more vehicles.

Organizational Chart

Information Technology
Scott Williams, IT Director
February 21, 2022

Additional Staffing Needs
- Cyber Security & Server Administrator
- IT Project Manager
- Computer Systems Administrator
- Database Administrator
- Computer Systems Administrator I – Software
- Computer Systems Administrator I – General
Vehicle Needs
- FY23 Requested Vehicles
  - F-150
  - 2 SUVs
- Current Vehicles
  - 1997 Ford Van
  - 2021 Ford F-250
  - 2002 Chevy Malibu (Surplus due to failure)
- FY22 Ford Transit Van (Replace Malibu) - Pending Availability

Capital Needs
- IT Equipment usually purchased on a 3-year term
- Current Needs for FY 23-25
  - Vehicle purchase capital for 22-21 ($800,000)
- Future Needs for FY 23-25
  - City Hall Order and San Ramon ($50,000)
  - Senior Emergency Replacement Part ($800,000)
  - Public Safety vehicle: New Vehicle Replacement Part ($800,000)
- Future Needs for FY 23-25
  - PC Replacement ($50,000)
  - Future Needs for FY 26-27
  - Senior Emergency Replacement Part ($800,000)

Council discussed the computer replacement program with Mr. Williams.

CDBG-CV Funding Options. Felicia Williams, Community Relations Director shared the following presentation:

CDBG-CV Funding
Felesia Williams
Community Relations and Development Director

Two rounds of CDBG-CV funding
- CDBG-CV Round 1: $204,664, allocated October 7, 2020 with a date of use of funds being 1/7/2020. The funding agreement is set to end 11/10/2024.
- CDBG-CV Round 2: $205,749, allocated August 24, 2021, with a date of use of funds being 1/7/2020. The funding agreement is set to end 11/10/2024.
- Total allocation: $410,413
- How much has been spent to date: $40,542.54

Breakdown of CDBG-CV spending...
- Per HUD's IDS system, $31,054.34 has been drawn for Administration.
- Per record on file, $2,116.00 has been reimbursed to Wages.
- Per record on file, $4,849.36 has been reimbursed to The Salvation Army.
- Total expended: $40,542.54

WAGES
- Allocated $41,132
- Contract expires June 30, 2022
- Providing assistance to low-to-moderate income senior citizens directly impacted by COVID-19, by delivering Meals on Wheels daily. The agency promises to serve at least 50 meals to individuals/households.

The Salvation Army
- Allocated $30,000
- Contract expires June 30, 2022
- Providing assistance to low-to-moderate income families directly impacted by COVID-19, including rent assistance, utilities assistance, assistance with clothing, and food. The agency promises to serve at least 30 households/200 individuals.

Agencies under contract per FY2020 Annual Action Plan
- 4 Day Movement (not proposed in 2020 AAP)
- WAGES
- The Salvation Army
- Partnership for Children of Wayne County
- YMCA

Total Committed: $156,123

Flexible Activities:
- Assistance to businesses, including Career Economic Development Assistance
- Public Services (Including emergency management)
- Housing, including Rehabilitation and Rebuilding, Conversion and Acquisition
- Building Improvements, including Construction
- Planning, Research, Building, and Technical Assistance

*Per HUD regulations, we are required to operate a CDBG-DR funded program that benefits individuals/households.
Council discussed the homeless commission, broadband and the 2020 CAPER with Ms. Williams.

United Way of Wayne County. Mayor Ham shared information about the process for funding non-profits in the city budget. Sherry Archibald, Executive Director shared the following presentation:
Mayor Ham shared that the United Way takes on the responsibility of vetting and they have an extensive vetting program. Councilman Broadaway shared it takes the pressure off Council. City Manager Salmon shared it takes the pressure off the manager. He shared the following slide with Council and shared there is a lot of work vetting these and it is possible we could give a certain amount of money to United Way and let them make those decisions. He shared some are not able to be funded by the United Way and would have to be funded separately. Councilwoman Matthews requested Council do the work themselves and give an opportunity to non-profits not within the scope of the United Way.

**FY22 City Funded NPOs**

1. Literacy Connections: $11,000
2. Rebuilding Better Places: $15,500
3. HDOC Community Crisis Center: $5,500
4. Boys & Girls Club: $5,500
5. Arts Council: $24,500
6. Wayne County Schools: $63,500
7. WAGS: CDBG-VF (prescr): $38,000
8. WAINCY: CDBG-VF (prescr): $34,000
9. Wimberly $15,500
10. Communities in Schools: $15,500
11. Department of Natural Resources: $12,000 (2021-2022)
12. Waynesboro Park: $12,000 (distributed to other NPOs)
13. Megofothash Project Inc: $8,500
14. MHS: $11,000
15. Three in One Family Center: $1

Total: $168,900

**SB-473.** Ron Lawrence, City Attorney shared information regarding SB 473. He shared information from NC General Statute 14-234, which states: No public official shall knowingly participate in making or administering a contract, including the award of money in the form of a grant, loan, or other appropriation, with any nonprofit with which that public official is associated. The public official shall record his or her recusal with the clerk to the board, and once recorded, the political subdivision of this State may enter into or administer the contract.

Council discussed non-profit boards and the new legislation with Attorney Lawrence. Attorney Lawrence shared that if Council is on a non-profit board and the city appropriates money to the non-profit, those non-profit boards would need to be removed from the annual budget ordinance and voted on as a separate item. The councilmembers that are part of those boards would then have to recuse themselves from the vote. Attorney Lawrence shared they can serve on the boards as an ex-officio non-voting member. He shared that the city needs to look at any of the non-profits that has a councilmember on their board and has decision-making authority on the board, we need to make sure Council doesn’t vote or participate in those processes. The city clerk will send a list of the non-profit boards the council serves on to the Finance Director.

**Economic Development Assessment.** Mayor Ham shared that he brought a proposal to the Council in 2018 for an Economic Development Study. He shared that Goldsboro does not have an Economic Development Plan. Amy Suggs and Lee Padrick with the NC Dept. of Commerce shared the following presentation:
Community Economic Development Assessment Plan (CEDAP)

The CEDAP is a short-term, efficient assessment that will "jump-start" communities' economic development efforts by providing action items. These action items will help communities achieve tangible outputs and outcomes.

Deliverables
Final Report
Community Economic Snapshot
Results of activities conducted during the assessment meeting
- Asset Identification
- Economic Drivers
- SWOT analysis
Stakeholder Interviews
Economic Positioning Statement/Vision Implementation Plan
Build upon the CEDAP to formulate and achieve additional goals in future years.

CEDAP Outcomes/Impact

The CEDAP adds value to a community's economic development efforts by developing consensus around the most important issues that should be addressed and by creating specific actions on how these should be addressed and by whom.

Examples of measurable impacts of such actions may include the following:
- Economic investment (public/private)
- Jobs created/retained
- New businesses recruited/started
- New (or expansion to existing) economic development programs or initiatives started

Questions?

AMY SUGGS
LEE PADICK

Council discussed the Economic Development Assessment. Mr. Padrick shared there would be no charge for the assessment. A resolution requesting the services of the NC Main Street and Rural Planning Center for the City of Goldsboro was presented for adoption. Councilman Aycock made a motion to accept the resolution as submitted, the motion was seconded by Councilman Broadaway and unanimously carried.

RESOLUTION 2022-9 "RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE SERVICES OF THE NC MAIN STREET AND RURAL PLANNING CENTER FOR THE CITY OF GOLDSBORO"

Retreat Discussion/Decisions. Mayor Ham asked for any discussion or comments from council. Councilman Broadaway stepped out of the room at 3:58 pm. Mayor Ham shared information about the ethics agreement with the LGC and reminded Council to complete the modules by the end of March.

The meeting recessed at 4:01 p.m.

FEBRUARY 22, 2022

The Mayor and City Council of the City of Goldsboro, North Carolina, held their Annual Retreat on Tuesday, February 22, 2022 at the Goldsboro Event Center, 1501 South Slocumb Street, Goldsboro, North Carolina with attendance as follows:

Present: Mayor David Ham, Presiding
Mayor Pro Tem Taj Polack
Councilwoman Hiawatha Jones
Councilwoman Brandi Matthews
Councilman Charles Gaylor, IV
Councilman Gene Aycock

Absent: Councilman Bill Broadaway
Others Present: Tim Salmon, City Manager
Laura Getz, City Clerk
Ron Lawrence, City Attorney
Roe O’Donnell, Temporary Assistant City Manager
Octavius Murphy, Assistant to the City Manager
Holly Jones, Deputy City Clerk
Kenny Talton, Planning Director
Jeff Cooke, GIS Specialist
Scott Williams, Information Technology Director
Felicia Brown, Parks and Recreation Director
Bert Sherman, Interim Public Utilities Director
Rick Fletcher, Public Works Director
Felicia Williams, Community Relations Director
Catherine Gwynn, Finance Director
Bobby Croom, Engineering Director
Adam Twiss, Paramount Theatre Director
Brad Hinnant, Assistant Information Technology Director
Erin Fonseca, Downtown Development Director

Call to Order. Mayor Ham called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

Temporary Assistant City Manager, Roe O’Donnell shared information regarding the Stantec Rate Study:

Council discussed rates, surplus and ARP funds with Mr. O’Donnell. Mayor Ham shared we have to make a decision about this before we construct our budget.

City Council Redistricting. Marshall Hurley and Bill Gilkeson with Poyner Spruill shared the following presentation:
Current District data using official 2020 Census

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Ideal District Pop</th>
<th>% Dev from Ideal</th>
<th>% Dev from Ideal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,406</td>
<td>5,610</td>
<td>-1,204</td>
<td>-21.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,347</td>
<td>5,610</td>
<td>+737</td>
<td>13.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,669</td>
<td>5,610</td>
<td>+59</td>
<td>1.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5,532</td>
<td>5,610</td>
<td>-78</td>
<td>1.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,024</td>
<td>5,610</td>
<td>+414</td>
<td>7.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5,679</td>
<td>5,610</td>
<td>+69</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total County</td>
<td>33,657</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential error in counting prison population

- 155 people were counted in this Census block just outside the city limits. No viable infrastructure appears in this Census block.
- The block of Census Counted is adjacent to the Census block that also includes the prison. The 2020 Census shows the prison, even if it was not Census Counted.
- It is apparent that the 155 people the Census counted in the river outside the city limits were prison inmates who should have been counted inside the city limits.
- Dr. Michael Cloe, the State Demographer, has noted this apparent error and corrected it in his May 6, 2022, statement of the city’s population. He said that he does not have the corrected data for this Census block.
- The process of correcting the US Census, called the Count Question Resolution process (CQR), began in January 2021. A CQR challenge to the accuracy of a city’s population must be filed by the city itself.

Effect of the apparent error on redistricting:

- It has no effect on whether Goldsboro is required to redistrict.
- It would affect how the new map for this decade must be drawn to be legally acceptable.

Comparison of official and corrected data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Districts using official Census</th>
<th>Current Districts using corrected Census</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>Total Pop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total County</td>
<td>33,657</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

§ 16A-23 District maps; reapportionment.

(3) If the city is divided into electoral districts, for the purpose of electing the members of the council, the map or description required by G.S. 16A-22 shall also show the boundaries of the several districts.

The council shall have authority to revise electoral district boundaries from time to time. If district boundaries are set out in the city charter and the charter does not provide a method for revising them, the council may revise them only for the purposes of: (a) accounting for territory added to or excluded from the city; and (b) correcting population imbalances among the districts shown by a new federal census or caused by exclusions or annexations.

When district boundaries have been established in conformity with the federal Constitution, the council shall not be required to revise them again until a new federal census of population is taken or territory is annexed to or excluded from the city, whichever event first occurs. In establishing district boundaries, the council may use data derived from the most recent federal census and shall not be required to use any other population estimates. (1990, c. 629, §71; 1995, c. 498, s. 1.3)

1. In order to minimize voter confusion, districts should retain their current configuration, to the extent possible ("core preservation")
2. Alternatively, the existing district lines should not be considered except to theextent legally required ("blank slate")
3. Avoid the pairing of incumbents in the same district
4. Follow natural boundaries and physical features, such as roads or waterways, to the extent possible
5. Use precincts as building blocks for the districts, to the extent possible
6. Recognize and respect neighborhood boundaries
7. Recognize and respect communities of interest, to be defined by the Council with public input
8. Consider areas of potential future population growth/decline
9. Districts should be reasonably compact, to the extent possible

Council discussed party affiliations, input from the Board of Elections and population vs registered voters (Neuse Corrections inmates).

After further discussion regarding redistricting, Poyner Spruill noted they would use the corrected census numbers. Council directed Poyner Spruill to keep districts compact with identifiable boundaries, not to take demographics into account when drawing lines and to consider incumbents and put them in different districts. Poyner Spruill mentioned that council could adjust maps when presented and that maps would be available to view online. Maps will be presented at the Council meeting on March 21, 2022.
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Mid-Year Finance Update. Catherine Gwynn, Finance Director shared the following presentation:

**6 MONTH FINANCIAL UPDATE**

Catherine Gwynn, Finance Director
Feb 22, 2022

---

### General Fund - Collections

**Comparison to 1st Six Months Actual FY22 vs. FY21**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY2022</th>
<th>FY2021</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18,720,621</td>
<td>18,520,000</td>
<td>200,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales &amp; Use Tax</td>
<td>5,550,000</td>
<td>5,500,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tax Revenues</td>
<td>1,790,000</td>
<td>1,790,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Income</td>
<td>10,700</td>
<td>10,700</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenues</td>
<td>412,000</td>
<td>412,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>18,720,621</td>
<td>18,520,000</td>
<td>200,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>18,720,621</td>
<td>18,520,000</td>
<td>200,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Fund Surplus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Utility Fund - Collections

**Comparison to 1st Six Months Actual FY22 vs. FY21**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY2022</th>
<th>FY2021</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13,200,000</td>
<td>12,780,000</td>
<td>420,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custom Parking</td>
<td>6,800,000</td>
<td>6,500,000</td>
<td>300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Contracts</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td>1,100,000</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>5,200,000</td>
<td>5,180,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>13,200,000</td>
<td>12,780,000</td>
<td>420,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>13,200,000</td>
<td>12,780,000</td>
<td>420,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Fund Surplus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Stormwater Fund Collections

**Comparison to 1st Six Months Actual FY22 vs. FY21**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY2022</th>
<th>FY2021</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Fee</td>
<td>1,575,000</td>
<td>1,575,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Fees</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>1,575,000</td>
<td>1,575,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>1,575,000</td>
<td>1,575,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Fund Surplus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Downtown District - Collections

**Comparison to 1st Six Months Actual FY22 vs. FY21**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY2022</th>
<th>FY2021</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Taxes</td>
<td>345,000</td>
<td>345,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Earnings</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Basics Feed</td>
<td>390,000</td>
<td>390,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Occupancy Tax - Collections

**Comparison to 1st Six Months Actual FY22 vs. FY21**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>FY2022</th>
<th>FY2021</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy - Commercial</td>
<td>1,055,000</td>
<td>1,055,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy - Residential</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>1,555,000</td>
<td>1,555,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditures</td>
<td>1,555,000</td>
<td>1,555,000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy Tax Surplus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Actual Collections
(Comparison to 1st Six Months Actual FY22 vs. FY21) – Recap by Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>FY21 Actual</th>
<th>FY22 Actual</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>55,109,124</td>
<td>66,852,764</td>
<td>11,743,640</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Fund</td>
<td>59,446,968</td>
<td>64,164,066</td>
<td>4,717,098</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Development Fund</td>
<td>48,239,160</td>
<td>53,184,000</td>
<td>4,944,840</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue (Combined)</td>
<td>65,793,800</td>
<td>74,201,800</td>
<td>8,408,000</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Expenditures
FY22 Operating Funds

### FY22 Actual Expenditures vs. Adjusted Budget
First Six Months

#### FY22 Actual
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Actual FY21</th>
<th>Actual FY22</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Fund</td>
<td>4,602,416</td>
<td>4,735,967</td>
<td>133,551</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal Operations</td>
<td>2,965,827</td>
<td>3,086,913</td>
<td>121,086</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Actual</td>
<td>7,568,243</td>
<td>7,822,880</td>
<td>254,637</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### FY22 Adjusted Budget
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FY22 Budget</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Fund</td>
<td>4,566,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal Operations</td>
<td>2,900,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Adjusted</td>
<td>7,466,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FY22 Actual Expenditures vs. Adjusted Budget
First Six Months - Recap

#### FY22 Actual
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Actual FY21</th>
<th>Actual FY22</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Fund</td>
<td>4,602,416</td>
<td>4,735,967</td>
<td>133,551</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal Operations</td>
<td>2,965,827</td>
<td>3,086,913</td>
<td>121,086</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Actual</td>
<td>7,568,243</td>
<td>7,822,880</td>
<td>254,637</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### FY22 Adjusted Budget
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FY22 Budget</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Fund</td>
<td>4,566,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal Operations</td>
<td>2,900,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Adjusted</td>
<td>7,466,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Operating Funds
Revenue & Expenditure Summary

### FY22 Revenue & Expenditures
First Six Months – Recap (cont'd)

#### Revenue
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Actual FY21</th>
<th>Actual FY22</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Fund</td>
<td>4,602,416</td>
<td>4,735,967</td>
<td>133,551</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal Operations</td>
<td>2,965,827</td>
<td>3,086,913</td>
<td>121,086</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Revenue</td>
<td>7,568,243</td>
<td>7,822,880</td>
<td>254,637</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Expenditure
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Actual FY21</th>
<th>Actual FY22</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Fund</td>
<td>4,602,416</td>
<td>4,735,967</td>
<td>133,551</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normal Operations</td>
<td>2,965,827</td>
<td>3,086,913</td>
<td>121,086</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Expenditure</td>
<td>7,568,243</td>
<td>7,822,880</td>
<td>254,637</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Capital Funds
Special Revenue Funds

### Capital Projects Summary
Governmental Type Activities
as of 12/31/2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Capital Expenditure</th>
<th>Capital Revenue</th>
<th>Capital Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>12,345,678</td>
<td>12,345,678</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety</td>
<td>3,456,789</td>
<td>3,456,789</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>9,087,654</td>
<td>9,087,654</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25,890,021</td>
<td>25,890,021</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Project Funds
Capital Project Funds

### City Council enacts Budget Ordinances

- Operating Funds
  - Ad 1 Item 30
  - Operating
- Project Funds
  - Capital Project Fund
  - Special Revenue Fund

23
Fund Balance Appropriations

Categories of Fund Balance Governmental Funds

Available Fund Balance – General Fund

Legal Definition of Available Fund Balance (G.S. 159-8(a))

Financial Performance. Ted Cole, with Davenport shared the following presentation:
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Juneteenth Holiday Discussion. Bernadette Dove, Human Resources Director shared information concerning the origin of Juneteenth. Council and the City Manager discussed the proposal to make Juneteenth a paid city holiday. Mrs. Dove discussed what it would cost the city and stated that we have some departments that work 24/7, Public Safety, Public Utilities, and some of Public Works and that they would get a day off at another time if required to work. Mrs. Dove stated that would take the paid city holidays from 11-12 to 12-13 (depending on Christmas). Mayor Pro Tem Polack made a motion to make Juneteenth a city holiday. The motion was seconded by Councilwoman Jones and unanimously carried. The holiday will be added to the FY 22-23 holiday schedule.

FY21-22 Budget ARPA SLFRF Guidance. Tim Salmon, City Manager shared the following presentation:
City Manager Salmon recommends taking the standard deduction of 8.8 million dollars and distribute it as was decided in FY22 and start paying down what we’ve determined to put the 1.7 million into the general fund into personnel. Council discussed the proposal with the manager and finance director. Mr. Salmon shared Catherine Gwynn, Finance Director has agreed to be the Program Manager.

Councilman Gaylord made a motion to allocate the 8.8 million dollars to offset personnel costs to take the standard allowance as shown by the manager and finance director today. Councilman Aycock seconded the motion. Mayor Ham, Mayor Pro Tem Polack, Councilman Gaylord and Councilman Aycock voted for the motion. Councilwoman Matthews and Councilwoman Jones voted against the motion. The motion passed 4:2.

City Manager Salmon distributed a letter to council and requested they approve an engagement letter with Greg Isley, CPA for the FY23 budget to enable the finance director to focus on the FY21 audit. The contract gives an estimate of about 150 hours at billable hours of $125.00 per hour for some of the senior management and $100.00 per hour for staff. Mr. Salmon stated this is an estimate of about $20,000.

Councilman Gaylord made a motion to approve the Greg W. Isley, CPA firm to oversee the preparation of the budget. Council discussed the fulfillment of the contract by the firm and the invoices submitted by the firm. The motion was seconded by Councilman Aycock and unanimously approved.

**Strategic Plan Discussion.** Octavius Murphy, Assistant to the City Manager shared information regarding the Strategic Plan to include goals, Council priorities and current metrics. He also asked discussed priorities with council.

**FY22-23 Budget Guidance.** City Manager Salmon requested guidance on the FY23 budget.

Mayor Ham and Council members provided comments regarding the retreat and thanked staff.

The retreat adjourned at 12:57 pm.