

**Town of Mineral Springs**  
**Town Hall**  
**3506 S. Potter Road**  
**Town Council**  
**Regular Meeting**  
**December 8, 2016 ~ 7:30 PM**

---

**Minutes**

---

The Town Council of the Town of Mineral Springs, North Carolina, met in Regular Session at the Mineral Springs Town Hall, Mineral Springs, North Carolina, at 7:30 p.m. on Thursday, December 8, 2016.

**Present:** Mayor Frederick Becker III, Mayor Pro Tem Peggy Neill (arrived at 7:37 p.m.), Councilwoman Valerie Coffey, Councilman Jerry Countryman, Councilwoman Janet Critz, Councilwoman Lundeen Cureton, Town Clerk/Zoning Administrator Vicky Brooks and Attorney Bobby Griffin.

**Absent:** Councilwoman Bettylyn Krafft and Deputy Town Clerk/Tax Collector Janet Ridings.

**Visitors:** Ms. Crystal Ellis, Mr. John Ganus and Mr. Archie Wallace.

With a quorum present Mayor Frederick Becker called the Regular Town Council Meeting of December 8, 2016 to order at 7:30 p.m.

**1. Opening**

- Councilwoman Cureton delivered the invocation.
- Councilwoman Critz and her granddaughters led the Pledge of Allegiance.
- Councilwoman Critz mentioned that her granddaughters' father, John, is a Captain in the United States Marine Corps and they just celebrated their 241<sup>st</sup> Birthday in November and yesterday was the 75<sup>th</sup> Birthday of Pearl Harbor. In honor of all of our servicemen, they wanted to do the Pledge of Allegiance.

**2. Public Comments**

- There were no public comments.

**3. Consent Agenda**

- **Councilwoman Coffey made a motion to approve the consent agenda with the corrections that have been issued containing the following:**

- A. *November 10, 2016 Regular Meeting Minutes*
- B. *October 2016 Tax Collector's Report*
- C. *October 2016 Finance Report*

**and Councilwoman Cureton seconded. The motion passed unanimously as follows:**

Ayes: Coffey, Countryman, Critz and Cureton

Nays: None

4. **Presentation of Funding to the Parkwood Band Boosters – Councilwoman Cureton**

- Mayor Becker introduced Councilwoman Cureton and the Parkwood Band Boosters to the audience and explained Councilwoman Cureton would be making a presentation. Councilwoman Cureton first commented “given unto God” and “the band is awesome”. Councilwoman Cureton continued she went to the last game and we have a wonderful band; she would like everybody to come to the games next year. Councilwoman Cureton missed two games, because she was away. They are awesome people, so this was not a hard job, it was a working job; Councilwoman Cureton didn’t get exactly what she wanted, but she is going to get it. Councilwoman Cureton thanked Mr. Wallace and Ms. Ellis for coming and for the wonderful job they do and presented them with \$910. Mayor Becker thanked Councilwoman Cureton and congratulated her for the incredible work on the school band program.

5. **Discussion and Consideration of the Proposed Nuisance Ordinance**

- Mr. John Ganus thanked the council for the opportunity to come and join them again and talk to them about the Nuisance Ordinance. Mr. Ganus reminded the council they had looked at some of the different things that could be considered nuisances and chose out of a long list, narrowing it down to seven major area groups of what they consider to be nuisances. What has been done now is that they have taken that list and surrounded it with the actual process of how it will be operated. Enforcement of a nuisance can only be within the corporate limits of the town. The complaints would come into the town and then whoever is going to be administering the ordinance would go out and do a site visit to determine if what is on the property is a condition that is identified in the standards and then from there you would go to “Section C”, which is a complaint investigation of public nuisance. What this does is it determines that once you go and determine that a violation does exist then you are going to send out a notification of violation. As a general rule, you are going to give them 10 days to bring the property back into compliance (to clean up the mess, cut the grass or whatever the violation is). This section also tells you how that notice is going to be mailed or how it is going to be delivered; it can be either delivered personally to the property owner, it allows for a person that is 16 years or older who is a member of the family living in that house be the one you can issue the notice to. The notice will have the property owner’s name and so forth on the actual notice, but you are going to be hand delivering it to somebody in that residence. It may be deposited in first class mail – the Statute does not require the notice to be sent by certified mail. N-Focus recommends when you are dealing with something that the law does not require you to use certified mail, but has a process that allows you to use first class mail, that’s how they recommend you do it. If the situation arrives to where the first class mail returns, then you have the option in Section C to actually reissue the notice with a new deadline and to post it on the property in a conspicuous place, so that it can be visible and it has to be posted giving at least 10 days for the deadline.

- In referring to Item 2, Mr. Ganus explained not every situation is going to be simple (i.e. the property owner can go out there in a weekend and mow the grass or whatever). You may have a situation where you have a hoarder, you may have a situation where you've got a large pile of stuff and it's going to take them a couple of weeks or more to get it out of there or you may have situations where somebody is ill or has been hospitalized and a notice was sent out; they get out of the hospital and come home and here is this notice, they call and explain and ask if it will be a problem if it takes them longer to get the problem resolved. Mr. Ganus would tell them it is not a problem. They want to work with the people. In another situation, if it's a large pile of debris or truckloads of stuff that has to be hauled off, then you have the option here to give them an extended period of time, so you are not locked into the 10 days. There is some flexibility for your enforcement officer to be able to work with the owners based on the situation and conditions that arise.
- Section D – property owners always have the right to appeal a decision. There is a process here that says if they make that appeal in writing within 10 days of the date of the notice that will “stay” the action on the property until such time as the Board of Adjustment has heard the appeal and makes a decision on it.
- Section E – Chronic Violator. This is something that is relatively new in the Statutes. The legislature has played with it a couple of times to fine tune it to where it is today – most of the language seen here [proposed nuisance ordinance] comes straight out of the Statute. When comparing the chronic violator to when the regular notice is issued you'll see that it's required to be sent by certified mail, you are going to give them a reasonable time to go and take care of the situation and bring it into compliance. In this situation, the law now allows that if somebody is identified as a chronic violator (a person who owns property whereupon in the previous calendar year the town gave notice of violation at least three times under any provision of the Public Nuisance Ordinance) no further notice is necessary, the town can just have the property cleaned up. Mr. Ganus further explained if you had three complaints on the same property under the same ownership in the past calendar year and you have sent notices out to the owner three times or more, then at the beginning of the next calendar year you can consider that person to be a chronic violator. Mr. Ganus stipulated the law does not say that the owner had to have his property cleaned up by the town, it says you gave notice, so a violation occurs, you send out a notice of violation, they clean it up – that's still one. A couple of weeks or a couple of months later they violate again, it may not be the same thing, maybe one time it's grass and one time it is a pile of trash/debris or maybe they are a contractor and they brought six water heaters home from job sites and piled them in the backyard, that's three different situations. Three different violations of the nuisance ordinance and three separate times that you issue a written notice of violation, three notices go out whether they clean it up or the town cleans it up, it doesn't matter. Once those three notices have been issued they can be deemed to be a chronic violator. What this step does is the next calendar year if they commit another violation you send them a notice (either certified mail, first class mail or posted on the property), part of the notice says that this is the one and only notice they are going to get this calendar year, the next time they are in violation no notice is required, the town can just contract with somebody to clean it up. This is really helpful when you have abandoned property and really helpful when you have a chronic violator. This has been in play for a two

or three years now and in most of the jurisdictions that N-Focus works in they have not had to use this, because when they send the first chronic violator notice they don't get any more complaints on their property, because the property owners decide to take care of it, because they know you can come on that property immediately without any warning, because you have already given them the one notice they get that year. The interpretation is that the second year (the year they are a chronic violator) they are not going to get three notices, but the following calendar year you start all over. Every time a violation occurs you have to make sure that it's the same property and the same property owner. If the property is sold, it's a different ballgame; it starts all over again.

- Abatement Procedure – Once a notice has been issued and you have given the property owner the appropriate time for the amount of violations there are (minimum of 10 days), then we have the right to go on the property and clean it up by hiring a contractor who has expertise in that area. Any cost related to that (for example, if we put a contractor on the property to mow it), that fee plus an administrative fee for the time whoever your code officer is, whatever time is involved in researching the property, site visits, writing the notices, etc., that time can also be included in the cost. You would then create a lien notice to include costs for the clean-up, mowing, etc., the administrator's time and police officers if they had to be called for some reason. There is the option of being able to issue civil penalties if the property owner does not bring the property into compliance as required by the notice; after that deadline the civil penalties can be issued at a rate of \$50 per day. Each day the violation continues beyond the deadline would be considered a separate violation, so they could receive \$50 a day consecutively through there. The other stipulation here is the misdemeanor violation under General Statute 14.4.; however, the proposed nuisance ordinance stipulates it will not be a misdemeanor violation; it will be civil penalties, which can be retained by the town. It also allows you to continue to not only issue civil penalties, but also to be able to go on and abate the property. You can utilize both avenues of enforcement and abatement; you can use one or the other or both. The notice of violation is considered the warning citation, which gives the property owner notice they are in violation, it tells them they have a specific number of days in which to get the property cleaned up. At the end of that timeframe, civil citations/penalties can be issued and the clean-up could occur. The owner does have the right to appeal within a 10 day period; after the 10 day period they no longer have a right to appeal. Civil citations are issued, which will state they have 15 days from the date the civil citation was issued to pay that penalty amount and that if they are also required to have it cleaned up by that time or civil penalties can be continued beyond that. Just because they come in and pay one civil citation that may have been issued doesn't mean you can no longer issue civil citations to them. You can continue, you can also go onto the property and abate if you have not already done so, but once you do the abatement you would stop issuing civil citations. If they do not pay the civil citations in the required time the town has a couple of options on how to collect that money. One is through small claims court, which currently has a threshold for a maximum of \$10,000 and the other option is through Debt Setoff.
- Mr. Ganus clarified the timeframe on civil citations. While civil citations aren't mandatory, if one is issued the property owner has 15 days from the issue date shown on the citation to pay it. If the violation exists on day two they are

responsible for another \$50 and on day three they are responsible for another \$50; there is no limit on how many [daily] civil citations are issued as long as the violation exists. Mr. Ganus explained for example he issued one today, they have 15 days from today to pay the first one. If he didn't go back and look at the property for three or four days he wouldn't issue the next group of civil penalties until the time he goes out to look at it and it's still in violation (nothing has changed); he has already issued one, he would then on Tuesday issue one for Friday, Saturday, Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, five more with the date of issue of Tuesday, but each of those citations are the date for the day of violation, but the issue date would all be Tuesday, so those four or five would be due in 15 days from that issue date. Each day the citation is "issued" starts the clock on that citation for 15 days. For example, today is the 8<sup>th</sup>, 15 days would be the 23<sup>rd</sup>, a civil citation is issued tomorrow with the deadline for payment being on the 24<sup>th</sup> for that one. Each citation has a 15 day limit. Mayor Becker commented what the town really wants is for the nuisance to be abated. Mr. Ganus responded that's it, we are not in this to make money, but issuing penalties gets the property owners to comply.

- Mayor Becker asked Ms. Brooks and Attorney Griffin if they had some technical questions or comments. It was noted that Attorney Griffin's comments/suggestions were more comprehensive than actual alterations as he was not trying to change anything. For instance, under Section C would it be 10 days from the date of the letter or receipt. Mr. Ganus clarified the way they do it in their letters is the 10 days is a calculation that the code officer should use, but when the notice of violation goes out the deadline should be a specific date deadline. They will calculate 10 days from the notice, plus add two or three days for mail time depending on the calendar. Mr. Ganus commented that they write that into the letter and he would be happy to give the town a copy of the notice they use; you can tailor it to your needs. If you have a person that gets it who has been on vacation, hospitalized, etc. and returns home to receive the letter and they only have three days until the deadline, what N-Focus has routinely had happen is they will call and say "hey, I got your letter, I want to talk to you about it, but I can tell you I can't make this deadline", so our next question is "well, how soon can you get to it". The property owner says "well, I can get to it over the weekend", or "give me another week and I can guarantee I can have it done". Mr. Ganus would say "it's a done deal, you got your week". They will make a note in the case file: the owner called and we extended it, because again the goal is to get it cleaned up and if they are willing to do it and they need a few more days, then by all means. They give a reasonable reason why they can't and we discuss with them and come up with a verbal agreement and make that adjustment. In some cases they will even send them a follow-up notice that says that the deadline has been extended especially if it's going to be a little bit longer. Councilwoman Critz asked if Mr. Ganus could clarify this in writing for the purpose of clarity. Mr. Ganus agreed to change it; what he will probably write it as is a deadline with a specific date "not to be less than 10 days from the date of notice". Attorney Griffin agreed, otherwise it would leave it to the interpretation of the enforcement person to build in when the 10 days is and is not and from an ordinance standpoint the council needs to be clear. Councilwoman Neill felt it was important to have the outgoing notice have the date mailed. Mr. Ganus explained that N-Focus recommends that on the letterhead you put a date of notice, date of issue at the top of the letter and then the property owner's mailing

address and the information on the property and then the body of the letter with a deadline on there and the right of appeal.

- Attorney Griffin commented that the chronic violator is identified as a person and not the condition on the property and asked if the Statute says it's got to be three violations in a calendar year or if it can be 12 consecutive months. Mr. Ganus responded the language in here [proposed nuisance ordinance] is verbatim out of the Statute; it is a calendar year. For example, if the council adopted this tonight the calendar year starts in 23 days, so you wouldn't be utilizing it now, you would start the clock beginning January 1<sup>st</sup>. Any violations on the property by the same owner on the same property during 2017 would be identified as a chronic violator beginning in 2018 through the calendar year of 2018 and then you start all over again. In 2018, you are sending one notice and then you are abating any multiple times it occurs. Then it starts over again in 2019.
- Ms. Brooks asked if the complaint procedure should be in the resolution. Mr. Ganus responded that was up to the town, but he recommended that the procedure itself not be within the ordinance. It should be a written policy or just the policy of the council. The reasoning for this is if it is written in the ordinance you are locked into it and the only way to change it is to amend the ordinance. If it is a written policy the council can make any necessary changes more easily. Mayor Becker commented that the policy might be adopted simultaneously with the ordinance, but it will be a separate thing.
- Ms. Brooks asked if the council would make it mandatory for them [complainant] to provide their name on the form to file a complaint or could it be an anonymous complaint. This could be in the policy. Mr. Ganus responded that is always a possibility. Councilwoman Critz commented anonymity allows people to do one of two things in her opinion: harass an individual, which we don't want to get in the business of that happening; or to make a legitimate complaint without the fear of retribution. Councilwoman Critz asked Mr. Ganus what he has seen work the best in the situations he has been involved in. Mr. Ganus began by saying the goal of any nuisance ordinance is to clean up the areas that are problem areas, it's not to nail down the foot of who wants to complain. At the same time you want to make sure they are legitimate complaints. As a code officer, when Mr. Ganus is working for a town it's his responsibility to go investigate every complaint whether it is anonymous or a signed letter, they have even gotten them as editorial complaints in the paper. Mr. Ganus recommended the town not make it mandatory to give their name. Mr. Ganus has run into a situation where there was a little old lady that lived by herself (she had lived there forever) and a big scary burly guy moved in next door bringing all of his stuff, his yard was a trash dump and her yard was meticulous. She called and was afraid to give her name, because he would get upset and come in and threaten her like he had already done on one occasion, so she wanted to be anonymous. Mr. Ganus has no problem with that. Whoever the code officer is should go out on every single complaint, look at this list, and look at the property to make the decision whether or not it is a violation. It is the code officer's responsibility to make the determination, not the citizen, because the citizen doesn't know all of this and it's not his or her responsibility to make the determination whether it's a violation or not. Mr. Ganus recommended taking the complaint however it comes in and go out and look.

- Ms. Brooks asked who gets fined – is it the tenant or the property owner. Mr. Ganus responded it could be either or both. A property owner is ultimately responsible for what goes on on his property. When you send out the notice of violation you are going to send it to the property owner, because he is responsible. If you have to do abatement on it the lien goes against the real property, you can't put a lien on real property unless you have issued a notice to the person who owns the property. They have run into times when they have no way of figuring out who the person is that is living there, they never answer the door or they are not home, so Mr. Ganus can't send a notice to the tenant, although he may be able to post one on the house to get him/her to respond, but ultimately if he has to end up abating it he needs to have notified the owner. Sometimes a notice of violation is sent to the owner and he calls and says "hey that's my tenant's stuff, why are you sending me the letter", you would explain to him and tell him you would be more than happy to send the notice to his tenant if he would tell you who he is. Then you issue a new notice to the tenant copying the owner and you are basically establishing a new deadline and you are going after both of them. You can issue penalties against the tenant, because you issued notice to him and you can issue penalties against the landlord, because you issue notice to him. If neither of them is willing to clean it up, you can go onto the property and clean it up and put a lien on the property, because you made all of the proper notifications.
- The following is a wrap-up of the final discussions on the presentation by Mr. Ganus:
  - The property owner would be the one found to be the chronic violator (per property), not the property itself. If the property owner changes three times in a year it (the chronic violator rule) starts over with each property owner.
  - A public hearing to adopt a nuisance ordinance is not required; however, it is recommended so citizens have the opportunity to come and speak. It has been the town's intention all along to conduct a public hearing prior to adopting the proposed nuisance ordinance if the council chooses to move forward with it. In addition to advertising the public hearing in the newspaper, notification will be in the town newsletter and will be on the town website.
  - It would be a good idea to have some questions and answers (FAQ) in the newsletter along with the notice of public hearing.
  - Mr. Ganus will make a change to Section C – adding language for a specific deadline.
  - A complaint will be taken whether it is by telephone, email, petition, written or people coming in the office. The complaints will generally come into Ms. Brooks and then will be turned them over to N-Focus.
  - The newsletter will contain a snippet about the town receiving complaints anonymously and the procedure on how to remain anonymous (i.e. no emails, unsigned letters, no return address), because all information becomes public information.
  - This item will be revisited in January and February.

## 6. **Discussion and Consideration of a Town Sponsored Clean-Up**

- Ms. Brooks reminded the council of the special meeting they had where they had mentioned investigating a town wide cleanup (like Waxhaw does twice a year) and explained she contacted RCS [Garbage Service] who provided the town with an estimate of the cost. Councilman Countryman commented \$8,600 was ridiculous.

Councilwoman Neill responded no, she thought it was good for the whole town. Councilwoman Coffey commented they would have dump fees which are exorbitant. Mayor Becker commented it was a lot of money, it may be fair, but it may be ridiculous for the town to want to spend that. Councilwoman Critz commented she thought the council would want to consider the size of our town and do it only once a year as opposed to twice a year like Waxhaw. Councilwoman Coffey responded once a year would be good and it would be a way to show that we are putting our best effort to help our residents not having to absorb these kinds of costs; therefore they would be more likely to get rid of some of this stuff. This is a good thing for our town to do, especially in light of the proposed discussion on the nuisance ordinance; it would help our town out a lot, because people are on limited income and so forth. Councilwoman Coffey believes it would be an awesome addition to services. Councilman Countryman responded if the town does it then he thought it would be most appropriate in conjunction with any discussion around the nuisance ordinance to really inspire these people. Councilwoman Critz offered the town could have the public hearing on the nuisance ordinance done by February/March and do this in the spring. Councilman Countryman responded what he was saying is that it needs to be communicated at the same time, so that people understand that we are spending a lot of money to do them a favor and give them the help that they may need to get rid of some of this stuff. Councilwoman Critz stated "we are spending their money; this is taxpayer money". Councilman Countryman commented the council was responsible to be good stewards of their money. Councilwoman Critz responded it's another way of providing a benefit to the community.

- Councilwoman Critz asked Ms. Brooks if there was a way that RCS can tell the town how successful this was in comparison to other towns they have done, if Mineral Springs does this concurrently with the adoption of the nuisance ordinance. We would certainly want to know in order to have some way to gauge whether we want to ever do it again. Ms. Brooks responded she was pretty sure he would be able to tell her, because he is probably going to be writing the check for the dump fees, so he will have an idea. Councilwoman Critz asked how many other towns they have done this in. Ms. Brooks responded Waxhaw. Mayor Becker noted Waxhaw has very high taxes to pay for this sort of thing. Ms. Brooks continued that he [Mr. Hudson from RCS] told her they provide garbage service to other towns and to some communities with an HOA. Councilwoman Critz asked if it [the fee] was based on the square footage of the community. Ms. Brooks responded he was familiar with Mineral Springs, because he has lived here all of his life, so he felt he gave a good estimate and knew he was familiar with the town.
- Councilman Countryman asked if the figure was at all negotiable. Ms. Brooks responded she did not ask him that. Councilman Countryman commented to Mayor Becker's point, they do it in Waxhaw because their tax base is dramatically higher than ours; they can more effectively afford to do this. Councilwoman Critz commented he is not charging the same; he's gauged his price according to our square footage and our town. Mayor Becker commented he was sure they charge Waxhaw a whole lot more. Councilman Countryman responded he was sure they do too, but his point is our tax base is a lot smaller and this is a lot of money; is there a possibility that it could be done for any less. Attorney Griffin asked if the negotiability was on the \$2,400, because the other is going to be whatever is charged at the recycle plant. Mayor Becker explained he had actually estimated



they were talking three vehicles for two days with probably two drivers in each vehicle; it's a lot of man hours. Mayor Becker wondered how he can do it for \$2,400. Mayor Becker commented he might be taking a risk and wondered if he was doing an estimate and taking the risk. Is it \$8,600 no matter what the dump fees are? Is he promising us that that is all it is going to be, so if we have a huge turnout and he's got 500 tons of garbage instead of 100, then he loses money? We have to make sure of that. We're going to have to execute a service agreement and approve it at a subsequent meeting if the council decides to go forward with it. Councilman Countryman stated it was a good idea to do, he is not opposed to it, he just thought it would work better in conjunction when it is tied to the nuisance ordinance and the population understands that we are doing this as a benefit to assist them. Mayor Becker asked if the council wanted to direct the clerk to get a formal service agreement from RCS that they can consider and a date or several dates that they could then choose from or do we need to wait until we know when our nuisance ordinance will be adopted. Councilwoman Coffey recommended that the council have Madame Clerk go ahead and get a formalized contract; it doesn't have to be a date to start, but a formalized agreement of what we would be looking at in cost.

- **Councilwoman Coffey made a motion for Madame Clerk to go ahead and get a formalized contract, it doesn't need to have a date to start but a formalized agreement of what we would be looking at in cost and Councilman Countryman seconded.**

*Ayes: Coffey, Countryman, Critz, Cureton and Neill*  
*Nays: None*

- Mayor Becker noted we have still not committed to doing it, but we will review any formal agreement.

#### **7. Discussion of Non-Profit Funding**

- Mayor Becker noted this item would be discussed at the meeting in January. Councilwoman Coffey added the council was looking to put it off until everyone was present as they did last month; January will be the month everyone should be here.

#### **8. Consideration of New Banners for Downtown**

- Mayor Becker noted the council had the samples of our present banners from SignPro and samples from Phonic Designs. Ms. Brooks began with answers to questions by Councilwoman Critz at a prior meeting about the current banners. Mr. Rorie from SignPro did not say there was anything that could be done about the fading colors; however, he did look at the possibility of putting them on a canvas, but they could only be one-sided. The lifetime of the current banners is two to three years, because they are on vinyl. Ms. Brooks thought some of the green ones that have turned may have been because of their location. Councilwoman Critz stated she thought the town should hang onto some of the ones that are in better condition, because, we might want to display them randomly at some of our festivals or other things like that; they could go on poles.
- After some discussion, the council agreed to have the old banners put back up after the Christmas lights came down until the Steeplechase banners go up in April.

This will give the council three months to make a decision on new banners and it will give them time to investigate the new company Phonic Designs; therefore, this item was tabled.

9. **Consideration of a Resolution to Release Copper Run Roads to NCDOT**

- Mayor Becker asked Ms. Brooks if she was satisfied that our procedure in the subdivision ordinance had been followed. Ms. Brooks responded yes.
- ***Councilwoman Coffey made a motion to approve the resolution to release the Copper Run roads to NCDOT and Councilwoman Critz seconded. The motion passed unanimously as follows:***

*Ayes: Coffey, Countryman, Critz, Cureton and Neill  
Nays: None*

- The Resolution is as follows:

**TOWN OF MINERAL SPRINGS  
NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
DIVISION OF HIGHWAYS  
REQUEST FOR ADDITION TO STATE MAINTAINED SECONDARY ROAD SYSTEM  
R-2016-02**

North Carolina  
County: Union

**Road Description: Crofton Drive (0.57 miles) and Springfield Drive (0.33 miles) in the Copper Run Subdivision in the Town of Mineral Springs in Union County, North Carolina.**

**Road Location: Off of SR3885 (Crofton Drive) at the intersection of SR3884 (Huntcliff Drive), as indicated in yellow on the attached map.**

**WHEREAS**, the attached petition has been filed with the Town Council of the Town of Mineral Springs in the County of Union requesting that the above described road(s), the location of which has been indicated in red on the attached map, be added to the Secondary Road System; and

**WHEREAS**, the Town of Mineral Springs Town Council is of the opinion that the above described road(s) should be added to the Secondary Road System, if the road(s) meet minimum standards and criteria established by the Division of Highways of the Department of Transportation for the addition of roads to the System; and

**NOW, THEREFORE**, be it resolved by the Town Council of the Town of Mineral Springs that the Division of Highways is hereby requested to review the above described road(s), and to take over the road(s) for maintenance if it meets established standards and criteria.

**ADOPTED** this 8<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2016.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Frederick Becker, Mayor

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Vicky A. Brooks, CMC, CZO  
**CERTIFICATE**



The foregoing resolution was duly adopted by the Town of Mineral Springs Town Council in the County of Union at a meeting on the 8<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2016.

WITNESS my hand and official seal this the \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2016.

Clerk, Town of Mineral Springs

**Official Seal**

Union County, North Carolina

\_\_\_\_\_  
Vicky A. Brooks

**10. Consideration of the 2017 Town Hall Holiday Schedule**

- Mayor Becker explained that the 2017 Holiday Schedule was pretty standard and it looked like the entire Christmas week was being proposed, because of the way it falls. Mayor Becker asked if it worked for everybody; if so was there a motion to adopt the schedule for the next calendar year
- **Councilwoman Critz made a motion to adopt the Holiday Schedule for 2017 and Councilwoman Coffey seconded. The motion passed unanimously as follows:**

*Ayes: Coffey, Countryman, Critz, Cureton and Neill*

*Nays: None*

**11. Staff Reports**

- There were no staff reports.

**12. Other Business**

- Councilwoman Cureton shared the good news that one of the houses she has been fussing about (the one next door to her) in Western Union Park was sold; one of her neighbors bought it for \$2,000.
- Mayor Becker explained what he knew about the news people [which was the cause of the interruption during the meeting]. The reporter told Mayor Becker there is a notice posted on the Sheriff's Department web page warning people that there have been some break-ins in a few neighborhoods in Mineral Springs in the past week; homes and cars are being broken into. The reporter did not say which neighborhoods it was, but Mayor Becker had previously heard that somebody was spotted in Charlton Oaks. Mayor Becker explained the reporter asked the usual questions: What do you think about this? Mayor Becker responded "well, it's terrible, we hate having criminals in our town". Mayor Becker's recommendation was what he always says in these cases "our police department is the Union County Sheriff's Office, we are glad that they posted this notification on their web page, so our citizens are aware and I will say what Eddie Cathey has told us repeatedly to your viewers, if you see anybody suspicious in your neighborhood, a suspicious vehicle, suspicious person, you call 911". Why do you think they are breaking in – do you think it is drugs? Mayor Becker responded "people do that all the time, it could certainly be drugs, who knows why someone wants to steal something, they just want to steal something". Has this happened before? Mayor Becker responded "my recollection is for that five or six years ago there had been a similar case where there was a small rash of burglaries, we actually met with the Sheriff's Department, with the Sheriff at that time and that was when he first told us

to notify our citizens, you call 911 and I said we have had some neighborhood watches setup, that's always a good thing. We're a close-knit community, people know their neighbors, they know who should be in their neighborhood, if it's a strange person wandering around in backyards, it's time to call 911". Mayor Becker stated it was Channel 36 and maybe the interview would be shown on the 10:00 p.m. news.


13. **Adjournment**

- **Councilwoman Coffey made a motion to adjourn and Councilwoman Neill seconded. The motion passed unanimously as follows:**

*Ayes: Coffey, Countryman, Critz, Cureton and Neill*  
*Nays: None*

- The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.
- The next regular meeting will be on Thursday, January 12, 2017 at 7:30 p.m. at the Mineral Springs Town Hall.

Respectfully submitted by:

  
Vicky A. Brooks, CMC, NCCMC Town Clerk



  
Frederick Becker III, Mayor