



The Mebane City Council held its regular monthly meeting at 6:00 p.m., Monday, January 4, 2021. Due to public health concerns related to COVID-19, the meeting was held virtually via Zoom.

Council Present via Zoom:

Mayor Ed Hooks  
Mayor Pro-Tem Jill Auditori  
Councilmember Tim Bradley  
Councilmember Everette Greene  
Councilmember Sean Ewing

Council Absent:

Councilmember Patty Philipps

City Staff Present at City Hall:

Assistant City Manager Chris Rollins  
City Clerk Stephanie Shaw  
IT Director Kirk Montgomery

City Staff Present via Zoom:

City Manager David Cheek  
Finance Director Jeanne Tate  
City Attorney Lawson Brown  
Development Director Cy Stober  
City Engineer Franz Holt  
Utilities Director Kyle Smith  
Human Resources Director Beatrice Hunter

Mayor Hooks called the virtual meeting to order and gave the invocation. He then announced that the City will be welcoming the new Assistant City Manager Preston Mitchell to Mebane on Monday, January 11, 2021. He shared that Mr. Mitchell has many years of local government experience, having served as the Manager of the following municipalities: City of Reidsville, Town of Nashville and Town of La Crosse, Virginia.

Mayor Hooks recognized Public Works Director Wayne Pore as he will be retiring January 31, 2021. Mayor Hooks read aloud the following resolution. Each member of the Council, along with Mr. Rollins and Mr. Cheek, expressed their gratitude for Mr. Pore's exemplarily service to the Mebane community over the last thirty years. Mr. Pore thanked them all for their comments and thanked them in return for the opportunity to serve the City of Mebane and its citizens.

**A RESOLUTION OF RECOGNITION AND APPRECIATION TO WAYNE PORE  
FOR 30 YEARS OF OUTSTANDING PUBLIC SERVICE**

**WHEREAS**, Wayne Pore began his career with the City of Mebane in the Public Works Department as a Groundskeeper and member of the mowing crew on October 4, 1991, and

**WHEREAS**, Wayne served in several other capacities during his career, including Sanitation Equipment Operator and Utility Crew Leader, eventually working his way up to Assistant Public Works Director; and

**WHEREAS**, on January 1, 2013, Wayne was appointed as the City's Public Works Director overseeing operations for streets, sanitation, recycling, utilities, and public facilities; and

**WHEREAS**, the City experienced unprecedented growth during Wayne's tenure as Director, yet with his leadership, the Public Works Department continued to maintain and even enhance the City's public infrastructure and facilities; and

**WHEREAS**, in the last eight years, the City has added 15 miles of streets, collected 32,000 tons of garbage, diverted 8,000 tons of recycled materials from the landfill, while seeing the number of homes served increase by 1,500, all under Wayne's steady supervision; and

**Whereas**, when ice, snow, or hazardous weather has come to Mebane, Wayne and his crew have fought the elements in the midst of the storm, and cleaned up afterwards, all the while keeping the residents of Mebane safe; and

**WHEREAS**, Wayne has delivered these services to the citizens with the utmost care and concern, calmly listening to citizen complaints, resolving differences among neighbors, and responding quickly to citizen requests for assistance; and

**WHEREAS**, Wayne, with his calm, kind, patient demeanor, has earned the respect of his colleagues and staff, the trust of the city residents, and the reputation of a dedicated public servant by the City Council; and

**WHEREAS**, throughout his three-decade career, Wayne has led by example, mentored his staff, instilled in them the values of commitment and teamwork, and provided excellent customer service to the citizens; and

**WHEREAS**, Wayne will be retiring on January 31, 2021.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the City Council does hereby commend Wayne Pore for his outstanding public service for the past three decades and expresses its deepest gratitude and appreciation for his dedication to the community.

Adopted this 4<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2021.

---

Ed Hooks, Mayor

During the public comment period, Clerk Shaw read aloud the following comments submitted via email.

*Dear City of Mebane:*

*Due to COVID concerns I will be I am unable attend in person, and will therefore send my concerns to be read by the City clerk during the meeting.*

*Our names are Ronald and Barbara Morris and we live in Arbor Creek Subdivision at 1045 Sweet Gum Way, Mebane, NC 27302. We have been made aware of a proposed new development adjacent to our property. While we are supportive of growth in Mebane, Diamondback Investment Group has submitted plans which raise several concerns for existing homeowners and which propose several exceptions to rules that Mebane has put in place to maintain integrity of all development.*

***Key Concerns:***

***Home Value:*** *We have significant interest in protecting the value of our home which has continued to increase in value since purchasing. We have concern that townhomes will drive down the value of our home.*

***Rezoning request:*** *Based on information received, the developer would like approval for a rezoning request for R-6 (high density). However, all the adjacent neighborhoods and those that will be connected to the new development are currently zoned R20 (low to moderate density) or B2 (Commercial). Since neighborhoods will be connected, I would request that the city stay in line with connected neighborhoods' current zoning and DENY the request to rezone to a R-6 development. We have a significant investment in our home/property and feel that re-zoning the adjacent property will impact the value of our home. Additionally, changing to an R6 have the potential to change the environment due to potential for high turnover of property. R6 construction tends to degrade quicker overtime due to the ownership is not for the long term and therefore the upkeep of the property/housing degrades due to lack of ownership.*

***Saturated Market:*** *We request that the City hold off on continuing to approve new large developments until other neighborhoods currently under development are at least 90% complete. Mebane is rapidly growing and the fact that several neighborhoods are being built, means there is a risk of too many starting up at one time and then the inability to complete all of them due to a drop in demand. Also, development could take longer due to the market being saturated and therefore those of us adjacent to those developments have to tolerate the mess for extended periods. Case in point, Arbor Creek experienced an issue where development ceased for an extended period due to economic downturn. The existing neighbors had to tolerate a partially developed neighborhood for years.*

***Respect to current homeowners:*** *Request that developers leave at least an ½ Acre of natural tree buffer between the new development and current property line. Many of the current owners including us, paid a premium (Additional \$5000) for their lots because of the view, privacy and increased natural area that they offered. Also, the increased natural area will assist with water*

drainage that is already a major issue in the area which frequently floods after a heavy rain.

**Increased road traffic.** With all the expansion around our area, the traffic continues to increase. Today, it is already difficult to turn onto Old Hillsborough road from our subdivision due to the increase in traffic and adding more neighborhoods is only going to make this issue worse. Additionally, we are concerned that making the road go all the way through will result in increased traffic in the neighborhood. We already have people that speed through the neighborhood and if you connect the new neighborhood to our existing one, it will cause more traffic to fly down our road.

**Storm drainage:** The developer is proposing to put an undesirable element of the development (storm drainage pond) directly behind current homeowners. This will increase insects and snakes and also present a potential danger to the many small children that live in those homes. In addition, there are already flooding and drainage issues in the proposed pond that backs up to Sweet Gum Way. I request that you require any new development to grade the property to direct waterflow away from existing neighborhood and locate the storm drainage ponds in the middle of their own development. It should not be placed on the edge which would require existing homes to have to tolerate the downside. The existing homes were purchased in their specific area because they chose not to select a cheaper lot which was located near one of Arbor Creeks storm drainage ponds. Therefore we request that you Grandfather in the existing homeowners and maintain an area behind them that is free from undesirable retention ponds. They should not be forced to now have to live next to one.

**Flooding issues:** City engineers need to carefully assess all development and consider current flooding issues to ensure it is not exacerbated by new development. A city-sponsored drainage plan needs to be developed to ensure no additional drainage issues for existing neighborhoods. Today there is a drainage ditch 20 feet behind our house and it already gets very full with a downpour. Anytime we have major rain we are concerned and keep a close watch on the water level. I am concerned that changing the landscape behind our home could result in flooding that could reach our house. This is a HUGE concern.

**Family Friendliness of neighborhood:** Based on current plans, the new development has minimal year-round family friendly features like a playground. Considering the new development and current community will be connected, there is a high probability of increased use of the current neighborhood playground which is maintained and funded by the neighborhood HOA. We request the developer be required to add more family friendly features to the new development.

**Sustainable growth & Infrastructure:** There are currently multiple neighborhoods underdevelopment within a 5 miles radius of the purposed development but there has not been any new infrastructure to support all this growth. There has been no expansion of roadways, turning lanes, traffic lights or schools. The city keeps growing at an accelerated pace but has not invested as quickly to support all of the current or 1000s of new citizens. We respectfully request that the city to be measured in what they approve and when they approve it. The infrastructure needs to catch up with the development.

Thank you for your time and consideration of our concerns.

Ronald and Barbara Morris

\*\*\*

Good Evening Mayor and City Council,

Let me start off by saying that I Love Mebane. It's true that it is "Positively Charming"! That's why I moved here and yes; I am part of the problem. As a resident of Mebane for almost six years, I feel more at home here than anyplace else I have lived. There is a perfect mixture of small-town shops and big corporate businesses and that gives the residents choices. However, the mixture is changing, and this Positively Charming town is becoming a big city with more apartments, condos and townhouses being built than single-family homes.

The stress this is putting on our infrastructure is horrible. The schools, the police and the fire department must be feeling the pressure to keep up. They only get a chance to react instead of acting and planning. When I first moved here, I would hear sirens at night maybe once a week. Now, I hear them almost every night!

The other problem that affects every Mebanite is traffic! The roads can't handle the amount of

people now. Can you imagine what the traffic will be like when every parcel of land has as many dwellings stuffed on it as possible? All areas of Mebane have this problem now, especially during the evening hours of 4 pm – 6 pm!

I feel a sense of closeness in this Mebane community – neighbors helping neighbors, walking downtown and talking to and buying from local shop owners. Saying hello to strangers and getting a hello back – and maybe a short conversation! I fear that Mebane is on the brink of becoming just another city with all the problems that come with it! I don't have a solution for these problems. The hope is community involvement and for the mayor and city council to find the right mixture of small-town charm and city living, and I truly hope and pray they can do that!

Thank You,  
Charles Stancati  
A proud Mebane resident!

\*\*\*

In regards to the development proposed by Diamond back off of old Hillsboro Road.

I just wanted to reiterate these concerns that many of the community members have in our neighborhood.

This development as planned will connect to our neighborhood at longleaf pine place. This will cause a massive increase in the amount of traffic coming through our neighborhood. At some point old Hillsborough road was slated to be widened however that has not happened. Our concern is that this connection will cause people to cut through our neighborhood in order to avoid the congestion at the 4-way stop at Mebane oaks & old Hillsborough.

Amenities:

This development as proposed has zero amenities for their community. With this community being connected to ours he has concerns that this will add additional wear & tear as well as use of the amenities in our neighborhood. Our neighborhood is made up of 240 homes and while we have very little amenities (playground, gazebo & doggy stations) our community pays for them via our HOA dues.

People who are walking through are sure to use our playground, and doggie stations which will cause us to have to pay more for maintenance especially the bags at the doggy stations. We also often host neighborhood events at the gazebo and don't feel that it would be fair to have to fund people in a adjacent community partaking in these events.

The these could be avoided by not allowing them to connect to our neighborhood at long leaf pine.

While we know development will happen, we pile ask that this not be connected to our neighborhood.

Thank you for your time

Ray Oliver  
909 Sugar Tree Drive  
Mebane NC

Mayor Hooks gave an overview of the Consent Agenda:

- a. Final Plat- Bowman Village, Ph. N1
- b. Quarterly Financial Report Ending September 30, 2020
- c. Snow and Ice Removal Agreement
- d. PART (Go Triangle) Renewal Agreement

Mr. Bradley questioned if any of the streets are outside of the City limits. Mr. Pore said most of the streets are in the City or in the ETJ. Mr. Bradley made a motion, seconded by Mr. Greene, to approve the Consent Agenda as presented. Per a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Mayor Hooks said there have questions about why the Council waits to vote on Public Hearing items until the following Wednesday. Mayor Hooks explained that North Carolina General Statute 166A-19.24 states that when a public body conducts a public hearing as a remote meeting, it must allow for written comments on the subject of the public hearing to be submitted between publication of any required notice and 24 hours after the public hearing.

He continued by saying that all of tonight's Public Hearings will be voted upon at the continued meeting to be held on Wednesday, January 6, 2021 at 6:00pm.

Mayor Hooks stated that the first public hearing to be held on a request for annexation of property located at 6016 W. Ten Road (address was corrected by surveyor) was requested per the applicant to be continued until the February 1, 2021 meeting. Mayor Hooks said the vote to continue will be held on Wednesday, January 6, 2021.

A virtual Public Hearing was held on a request from staff for approval of the Buckhorn Area Amended Long Range Plan. Mr. Stober explained that he would be giving an abbreviated presentation tonight; all slides from the December meeting PowerPoint are on hand for reference if needed. He continued with a recap of the request sharing that In December 2019, the Mebane City Council, at the recommendation of the Planning Board, annexed and zoned two properties to M-2 ("Light Manufacturing") that lay outside but adjacent to the CLP's geographic scope, with the rationale that the action was consistent with the goals and objections of the CLP. Per North Carolina General Statutes, the City has an obligation to revise its adopted plans to reflect Council actions. At minimum, the Comprehensive Land Development Plan Mebane By Design must be amended to reflect the actions of Council, expanding the Plan's Future Growth Area and Primary Growth Areas to include these properties that are currently beyond its scope. This study expands the boundaries of the original BEDD in order to utilize the land most suitable for economic development, especially reasonable or potential access to infrastructure, including these two newly-annexed properties. If acted upon by the City, the study area and the plan's recommendations will be integrated into an amended CLP to revise its Future Growth Area and G 2 Industrial (V) Primary Growth Area, "Part of BEDD and North of US-70." He stated the BAP is not a rezoning study, not a study to support eminent domain, nor is it an annexation study. Any annexations would be voluntary and considered on a case-by-case basis. Any annexations or rezoning requests would require further public notification and public hearings to allow for public input. Per public comment and Council feedback at the December 7, 2020 meeting and due to the fact that the Orange County Commissioners have not considered this matter at all, staff is recommending acceptance of the BAP for guidance, not adoption. By not adopting the BAP, staff cannot legally include it in their finding of facts when preparing staff reports or when presenting an item to the Planning Board or City Council. At minimum, the Comprehensive Land Development Plan Mebane By Design must be amended to reflect the actions of Council, expanding the Plan's Future Growth Area and Primary Growth Areas to include properties that are currently beyond its scope, specifically the Medline properties, 6016 West Ten Road and properties north of the I-40/85 weigh station. Mr. Stober presented two (2) alternatives for consideration in adopting the "Buckhorn Area Plan".

- Buckhorn Area Plan Revision 1: "Medline South", 6016 West Ten Road, Focus Area A, & Focus Area B
- Buckhorn Area Plan Revision 2: "Medline South", 6016 West Ten Road, & Focus Area A.

Mr. Bradley asked what the advantage of approving the plan that includes Focus Area B would be with people contesting it due to the fact that they consider it traditional farm land or residential land. Mr. Stober said the advantage would be that staff can make a recommendation about whether or not a proposed project is consistent with the adopted plans. Mr. Bradley said he would prefer the map that does not include Focus Area B. Mr. Ewing agreed and stated he feels the map is still missing some updated information since the public input at the December meeting. Ms. Auditori said, along those lines, she is also questioning the inclusion of focus area A. She said if she recalls correctly, last month she asked about focus area A and someone noted that there had been no public concerns expressed about including area A which different than those property owners giving the City "a nod" saying that want to be included so she would like clarification on why focus area A is being left in if it follows the same logic as all of the other focus areas. Mr. Stober said during the preliminary stage, staff met with a property owner that owns several parcels in that area and there was stated interest in being included and having access to City utilities for

economic development purposes. Mr. Bradley said his understanding is the difference is focus area A has utilities currently available and focus area B does not. Mr. Stober said yes, the number one obstacle for focus area A is road frontage and rail access. Mr. Rollins said most of focus area A was in the current CLP but there was an addition of properties north of weigh station per property owner request. Mr. Stober stated over half of focus area A is in the currently adopted CLP and focus areas B, C, D and E are not.

Beth Bronson, 1222 Buckhorn Road, Mebane, NC, joined the meeting via Zoom. She began by thanking Council and City staff for the transparency and communication. She said she and several others realize that this plan is a future land use plan and that it is not a rezoning effort, not an annexation effort, this is a plan to proceed with how to address annexation proposals and commercial development. She said this area has been identified as a commercial and industrial transition activity node and has been so identified since the UDO was put in place and sometime after the Mebane-Efland Small Area Plan but before the 2012 Utilities Agreement. Her concern as a resident in this area and bordering this transitional node, is that there has not been a lot of transparency from Orange County in the way that it has been marketed in general. She said moving forward when discussing the BAP, let's not pretend that the area will stay rural residential if this plan is adopted and as development increases. This is basically a template to developers in the commercial industry to create a template on how to apply for the land purchases. She said she agrees that land owners should have the right to sale and developers should have a template to follow. She commended Mr. Stober for his approach in presenting to the public and to the Council. She requested that as the BAP and the technical study is looked at that a precedent be set now for what will be expected of the developers, for land conservation, NCDOT involvement, road maintenance, etc. as these things are all very important. She said there needs to be more information considered regarding the traffic impact and impact on the roadways. She said there are a lot of plans that address this area but none of them are cohesive and the BAP does not contribute to consolidating those plans. She expressed her displeasure with tax incentives. She said she would like to see the UDO updated and the CLP amended so that the BAP can be written in a way that follows those plans. She also requested that the PTRC maintain an accurate up-to-date website. She concluded her comments with a complaint regarding the development underway on Bowman Road.

Fiona Johann, 5016 Johann Lane, Mebane, NC, joined the meeting via Zoom. She echoed Ms. Bronson's comments thanking Council and City staff for the work they have been doing. She said she also understands that the BAP is not a rezoning anything but it does serve as an advertisement to any warehouse developer that Mebane is the place to come. She said her problem with the BAP is that it is recommendations vs. requirements. She does not like that the plan extends the areas that are outside of Orange County's 2030 Development Plan and the development is creeping closer and closer. She feels the BAP will allow for more of that.

Mr. Greene encouraged the residents also express their concerns to the Orange County Commissioners as well. Mr. Bradley thanked Mr. Stober and City staff for their effort in advertising and making this plan transparent as was recognized by the citizens. He requested that Mr. Stober keep Council apprise as to when the BAP is brought before the Orange County Commissioners. Mr. Stober stated he would do so. Ms. Auditori said if the BAP is accepted, it will be used for guidance, not a list of requirements but is there a way to integrate requirements for matters such as 100-foot buffers. Mr. Stober said he plans to bring an informational item before Council at the February meeting discussing the opportunity to amend the UDO in tandem with the statutorily required amendments of 106D.

Mr. Rollins said that a question was received via the Zoom chat, asking if the City Council would be adopting the BAP before the Orange County Commissioners review it and the answer is, they will not; *staff is recommending the minimum action of Council to amend the City's Comprehensive Land Development Plan Mebane By Design to expand its geographic scope and that of G-2 Industrial (V) Growth Area to include the properties shown in "Buckhorn Area Plan Revision 2."* The Buckhorn Area Plan is recommended to be accepted as guidance, but action delayed until it is formally presented to the Orange County Board of Commissioners for their discussion and an interjurisdictional dialogue.

Mr. Greene made a motion, seconded by Mr. Ewing to continue the hearing until Wednesday, January 6, 2021 at 6:00pm. The motion carried unanimously per a roll call vote.

Ms. Tate presented a request for acceptance of the FY 2019-20 Audit. She explained that at the December 7, 2020 meeting she presented a preliminary review of the City's financial statements and at that point in time they had been submitted to the State but had not yet received their approval, since then the City has received their approval. She said nothing that she presented at that meeting has changed therefore, she turned the presentation over to Patricia Rhodes, Auditor with Stout, Stuart, McGowen and King, LLP.

Ms. Rhodes joined the meeting via Zoom. She thanked Council for the opportunity to join the meeting to discuss the Audit Report for FY ending June 30, 2020 and for the opportunity to be the independent auditor for the City. Ms. Rhodes stated Mebane received an unmodified opinion. She reviewed highlights of the audit and shared a comparison of Mebane's fund balance to similar municipalities. Mr. Greene made a motion, seconded by Mr. Ewing, to accept the audit. The motion carried unanimously per a roll call vote.

Mr. Brown presented a request from Kenny and Elizabeth Knight, who are currently renovating the Burgess Building located at 104 S. Fourth Street. He stated that they are requesting the approval of the Deed of Easement and Party Wall Agreement for the relocation and expansion of the Duke Energy meter bases on City owned property at 101 W. Washington Street (Mebane Fire Station #1). Mr. Brown said staff recommends approval. Mr. Bradley made a motion, seconded by Mr. Greene, to approve the Deed of Easement and Party Wall Agreement as presented. The motion carried unanimously per a roll call vote.

Mr. Holt joined the meeting via Zoom and presented a request for approval of a proposal from Schnabel Engineering South, P.C for further evaluation of Lake Michael Dam. He said this proposal follows a condition assessment completed in October 2020. From their executive summary, it appears that the overall condition of the dam is fair considering its age and meets hydraulic capacity requirements. However, due to multiple structural deficiencies identified with the spillway, they recommend replacing the existing spillway with a new spillway. Other recommendations are as follows:

- Conduct a robust monitoring program
- Inspection of the intake tower, gates, and low-level conduit
- Installation of a means of lowering the lake level
- Complete topographic and bathymetric surveys of the site
- Installation of a toe drain and filter diaphragm around the low-level conduit
- Clear trees from the outlet channel and plunge pool area and along the upstream right abutment

After reviewing the condition assessment, staff asked for a proposal from Schnabel to provide recommended next steps which are as follows:

1. Further Investigations of the Intake Tower, Low-level Conduit, Spillway Subsurface, and Surveying.
2. Update the current Emergency Action Plan and include Inundation Mapping.
3. Provide an Alternative Analysis of new Spillway Design with opinion of probable construction cost.
4. Review possible Project Funding and Eligibility Assessment.

Staff recommends approval of Schnabel's proposal for Engineering Services for Lake Michael Dam. Mr. Bradley made a motion, seconded by Mr. Greene, to approve Schnabel's Engineering Proposal for Lake Michael Dam. The motion carried unanimously per a roll call vote.

Rachel Nilson, CPL Engineer and Project Manager, joined the meeting via Zoom. She presented an update for the Comprehensive Facilities Plan. She explained that their team is looking at departmental needs and facility needs reaching over the next 15 years; putting together capital planning reports and cost estimates so the Council and staff have a plan to move forward with. She said their scheduling is on track and they hope to have a final report ready by February. She shared PowerPoint slides which broke down in detail work being done for building assessment and analysis and department assessment and analysis. She explained that they are developing a dashboard that will allow for digital organization of all the data they have gathered and it will be

searchable. Mr. Bradley asked if Council will receive a hard copy of the final report before the final presentation. Mr. Rollins said staff will be happy deliver hard copies of the draft final report. No action taken.

Mr. Smith joined the meeting via Zoom and presented a request for Council's adoption of a Cross-Connection Control Ordinance. He explained beginning January 1, 2020, water systems with five or more testable backflow prevention assemblies must start an inventory of existing backflow prevention devices. Records of the location, type, size, and field tests must be maintained for each device identified for a minimum of four years. The Utilities Department is nearly complete with the inventory of devices and is nearing the point where staff will need to reach out to all device owners requesting testing records. During a recent Distribution System Compliance Inspection, the State strongly recommended that the City adopt and implement a Cross-Connection Control Ordinance. The ordinance is supplemental to the North Carolina State Administrative Code Section 15A NCAC 18C.0406(b) of the Rules Governing Public Water Systems. The intent of this ordinance is to ensure a safe water distribution system by providing regulatory authority to the City of Mebane for cross-connection testing, inspection, reporting, and enforcement. When it is determined that a backflow prevention assembly is required, this ordinance will require the installation of an approved backflow prevention assembly and require that testing is done on each assembly. Mr. Smith shared that the downside will be that the owners of such devices will be required to pay for the testing. There was discussion regarding the financial hardship this could cause on some property owners. Mr. Rollins said the rules have been put in place by the State Environmental Protection Agency mandating compliance. Mr. Bradley made a motion, seconded by Mr. Greene, to adopt the Ordinance as presented with the understanding that should a situation arise the City will work with those property owners to get it resolved. The motion carried unanimously per a roll call vote.

Mr. Brown presented a request for approval of the Racial Equity Advisory Committee (REAC) application for the Committee membership and to set a timetable for receipt of applications, the screening of the same and the selection of Committee members.

Council discussed and clarified a section of the REAC Ordinance adopted at the December 7, 2020 meeting. Ms. Auditori made a motion, seconded by Mr. Greene, to amend the ordinance as follows:

*The Committee shall be comprised of seven (7) members appointed by the City Council, for staggered two-year terms except that four (4) of the initial Committee shall be appointed for four (4) years. At least three (3) members must be residents of the City. Members may serve two full consecutive two-year terms. **Except as to the three members living inside the City Limits, members may be residents of the City, the City extraterritorial district or may live within one mile of the primary (non-satellite) corporate limits of the City.** Members can be removed at the discretion of the City Council for good cause.*

The motion carried per a roll call vote. Mr. Bradley made a motion, seconded by Mr. Greene, to approve the REAC application as presented and to set the timetable as follows. The motion carried unanimously per a roll call vote.

- Applications should be received by March 10<sup>th</sup>
- Applications will be screened by staff for address eligibility, then sent to Council for review on March 18<sup>th</sup>
- Committee members should be selected at April 16<sup>th</sup> meeting

Ms. Hunter joined the meeting via Zoom and presented a request for Councils' consideration for approval of Mebane COVID Sick Leave as an extension of the federal provision of Emergency Paid Sick Leave (EPSL) under the Families First Coronavirus Response Act (FFCRA), which expires on December 31, 2020. She said the goal of approving Mebane COVID Sick Leave would help encourage employees with COVID symptoms to stay home and would further protect employees at work. The maximum entitlement of these special sick leave types (EPSL and Mebane COVID Sick Leave) is 80 hours. Employees who have used the federal leave entitlement (80 hours) will not receive an additional "bucket" of Mebane COVID Sick Leave. EPSL balances will be carried forward and employees will use no more than 80 hours of combined EPSL/Mebane COVID Sick Leave. Approval by the Council would make these benefits effective January 1, 2021 through June 30, 2021, only if the federal government does not pass a mandate for this extension. After



considerable discussion, Mr. Ewing made a motion, seconded by Ms. Auditori, to approve Mebane COVID Sick Leave as presented. The motion carried unanimously per a roll call vote.

Mr. Cheek commended Mr. Rollins, Mr. Brown, Ms. Shaw, Ms. Tate and Ms. Hunter for rising to the challenge during this unprecedented year of the COVID -19 pandemic. Mr. Rollins said that Mr. Montgomery and all of the department heads should be commended as well.

Ms. Tate presented a request for Council’s consideration to approve a budget ordinance amendment- 2020-21 additional sales tax and appropriations. She explained at the December Council meeting, the financial update for the current fiscal year showed that revenues have been less severely impacted than was feared when the 2020-21 budget was adopted. The budget ordinance amendment would appropriate the sales taxes for projects as listed.

- Street Resurfacing
- Racial Equity Training
- Downtown Coordinator
- Public Works DOT Agreement

BE IT ORDAINED by the Council of the City of Mebane that the Budget Ordinance for the Fiscal Year Beginning July 1, 2020 as duly adopted on June 1, 2020, is hereby amended as follows:

**ARTICLE I**

APPROPRIATIONS	Current Budget	Change	Revised Budget
<b>GENERAL FUND</b>			
Administration	\$ 1,138,700	\$ 20,000	\$ 1,158,700
Public Works	1,877,322	290,600	2,167,922

**ARTICLE II**

APPROPRIATIONS	Current Budget	Change	Revised Budget
<b>GENERAL FUND</b>			
Local Option Sales Tax	\$ 3,190,243	\$ 270,600	\$ 3,460,843
DOT Reimbursement	-	40,000	40,000

This is the 4th day of January, 2021.

Ms. Auditori made a motion, seconded by Mr. Bradley, to adopt the budget ordinance amendment as presented. The motion carried unanimously per a roll call vote.

Mr. Stober announced that the City is currently seeking three (3) residents to serve on the Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee with application being due by January 19<sup>th</sup>. Interested parties should contact City Planner Ashley Ownbey. He also announced that the City will be hosting a virtual public meeting on January 7, 2021 to receive input regarding the Lowes Boulevard Corridor Plan. He stated there is a dedicated website with interactive maps and a survey. To participate during the virtual meeting, contact Ms. Ownbey.

Mr. Greene commented on how beautiful the Christmas lights around the City were this year. He thanked the Mendenhall family for placing the grapevine ball lights in the trees of the Fifth Street Pocket Park. Mr. Bradley suggested that money be placed in the budget for additional Christmas lights next year. Ms. Auditori commended Mr. Davis on the “Snowing in Mebane” Event.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:35pm.

Attest: \_\_\_\_\_  
Stephanie W. Shaw, City Clerk

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ed Hooks, Mayor