



CITY OF  
**Swainsboro** GEORGIA  
*Crossroads of the Great South*



## City Council Meeting

The regular meeting of Mayor and City Council was held **Tuesday September 6, 2022**  
at 6:00 P.M. City Hall.

**Members Present:** Sconyers, Stafford, Parker, Collins, Davis, & Quarterman

**Prayer of Invocation:** Pastor Andrew Flowers, Eastwood Church of God

### Pledge of Allegiance

Councilperson Stafford made a motion to accept the August 15<sup>th</sup> minutes.

**Motion by: Stafford**

**Seconded: Sconyers**

**Vote: 6-0**

### A. Old Business:

1. Councilperson Sconyers made a motion to amend the agenda to allow Dr. Kemp Jones to address the council.

**Motion by: Sconyers**

**Seconded: Stafford**

**Vote: 5-1**

**Against: Davis**

2. Council considered the alcoholic beverage license application for Julian Cortez Cruz dba La Rosita Mexican Restaurant located at 206 West Moring Street. Councilperson Parker made a motion to approve the alcoholic beverage license.

**Motion by: Parker**

**Seconded: Quarterman**

**Vote: 6-0**

3. Matthew Bright was not present.

4. Councilperson Davis nominated Randall Snellgrove as the president of the Tree Board committee. Councilperson Quarterman nominated K.E. McNeal. Councilperson Stafford nominated Councilperson Davis. Mayor Bennett nominated Bruce Kirby. Mayor Bennett stated the city would contact the Georgia Forestry Department to get a nominee for the ex officio forestry seat. Richard Claxton was present and asked council consider Lige Moore as a nominee. Motion was by Councilperson Sconyers to approve the nominees to the tree board committee.

**Motion by: Sconyers**

**Seconded: Davis**

**Vote: 6-0**

5. Barbara Moore with the Humane Society addressed the council regarding the drainage issue. Chris Morton stated that they will begin making the repairs to the sewer line this week. Ms. Moore asked for an update on allowing foster homes for the animals at the animal shelter. The city attorney, Jon Levis, stated that the Georgia Animal Protection Act regulates fostering. Levis stated that fostering is allowed. Levis stated that the law requires a written contract and two annual inspections of the foster home. Levis stated that the Georgia Department of Agriculture can limit the number of animals per foster home. Levis recommended to the city that the city has appropriate insurance coverage. Levis recommended that the animal shelter/Humane Society provide a proposal as to the vetting and mechanics of fostering and any draft contract to the city. Levis stated that the city would enter a master contract and then a contract that is required by the fostering homes and in that the city would require appropriate insurance for the fostering home. Levis stated that the city would need to speak with the county to verify that there are no issues with allowing the fostering homes. Ms. Moore stated that the Humane Society is meeting with the county commissioners at their next meeting. Mayor Bennett asked the Humane Society to present their proposal and the council would look into allowing foster homes.

6. Dr. Kemp Jones addressed the council regarding placing Sunday alcohol sales on the ballot. Dr. Jones encouraged the council to have the attorney draft an ordinance that would be legal, and the city council could support. Dr. Jones stated that he is well aware of the problems of substance abuse. Dr. Jones stated that he advocated for the mixed drink referendum years ago while he was on the council which allowed the citizens of this town to decide what they wanted. Dr. Jones stated that this would allow our citizens the opportunity to enjoy casual fellowship and employment opportunities. Dr. Jones stated that this will allow the city to collect a substantial source of revenue. Dr. Jones stated that the police reports and the newspapers has only worsen in recent years, but that abuse is from illegal substance abuse and not from the legal sale of alcohol. Dr. Jones urged the city council to authorize the city attorney to draft an ordinance that the council can pass onto the people of this community to voice their opinion. City attorney, Jon Levis, stated that for the record that to the extent we are discussing package sales the mayor cannot be involved in that discussion. Mayor Bennett stated that he is all for allowing the citizens to vote by referendum for the on-premises Sunday sales. Councilperson Parker stated he is all for allowing the citizens to make the decision as to Sunday alcohol sales. Mayor Bennett asked was it to late to put it on the ballot for November. Levis stated that the shortest time to get on-premise Sunday alcohol sales on the ballot would be 42 days and the longest period would be 92 days and that is from the day of passing. If you are doing as an ordinance you would need about 60 days between the two readings which would be 100 to 150 days. If you are doing a package store, there is 29 days once the resolution or ordinance is passed. If it is done via ordinance it would add on another 60 days to this process for a total of 90 days. Levis stated that if we don't use the same equipment as the statewide election, it would only be 29 days which is going to be an expense on the city for the equipment. If we use the statewide election equipment, we are looking at the earliest the 1<sup>st</sup> Tuesday in March or 1<sup>st</sup> Tuesday after the 1<sup>st</sup> Monday in November and that's if it is in 2023 election cycle. Mayor Bennett asked Levis if it was possible to get it on this year's November ballot for on-premises. Levis stated that only if you pass a resolution but that is not his recommendation. Levis further stated that it gives the election superintendent a period of time to put it on the ballot. Dr. Jones stated that this is something that the council needs to address but is not an immediate issue.
7. Councilperson Parker had a question regarding the property that Ida McMillian addressed the council. Parker stated that the McMillian was told that the city would take bids for 30 days. Parker stated that 30 days would be September 15<sup>th</sup> and asked if the council would meet again prior to the October meeting when the seal bids were told to be turned in. The city clerk stated that the bid opening is schedule for October 3<sup>rd</sup>. Levis stated that there are certain statutory requirements regarding sealed bids. Levis stated that the legal description of the property, the due date and the bid date opening must be included in the notice. Councilperson Parker asked where the properties are being advertised. The city clerk stated that they are in this week's paper. Levis stated that if proper procedure is not done someone can challenge the recipient of the property.

## **B. New Business:**

1. Chris Morton with Clearwater Solutions addressed the council regarding BIO solids hauling. Mr. Morton presented several proposals for alternative ways to haul the BIO solids. Morton stated that the previous contractor had the equipment to provide this service for the city. Morton stated that the current hauling contractor is charging the city \$75 per ton but the actual cost to the contractor is only \$28. Morton stated that the contractor is charging the city \$250 per month just for the containing. Morton presented proposals for in-house hauling to save the city monies. Morton presented two in-house hauling options verses the current hauling services. Mayor Bennett stated that with the savings we could pay for the truck and equipment. Morton stated that this option would make the treatment plant more efficient. Councilperson Davis asked does Clearwater currently have a truck like this in their inventory. Morton stated that they do not. Council discussed the maintenance on a truck like this. Councilperson Parker asked if a new truck like this would qualify under SPLOST. The clerk stated that this would qualify under SPLOST. Mayor Bennett stated that we need to verify that the city does

not currently have a contract with the current hauling company. Council asked Morton to get a price on a new truck and a good used one.

2. Council considered for advertisement an alcoholic beverage license application for Shaishav Patel Cruz dba A & D Mart LLC located at 504 East Main Street. Motion was made by Councilperson Parker to advertise.

**Motion by: Parker**

**Seconded: Stafford**

**Vote: 6-0**

3. Michael Bright addressed the council regarding the ongoing flooding issues at the Main Street Market. Mr. Bright stated that he was hired as the market manager 9 years ago and this has been an ongoing issue. Mr. Bright stated that there has been an ongoing flooding issue on the Food Pantry side. Mr. Bright stated that they have not had any flooding issues on the Dollar General side. Mr. Bright requested that the city tear down the Food Pantry building to fix this problem. Mayor Bennett asked had Mr. Bright address the council previously regarding this issue. Mr. Bright stated the DDA and the former city administrator knew about this issue. Councilperson Stafford stated that he had been to the market to look at it and there is a problem. Councilperson Parker stated that he was under the impression that the building was going to be torn down due to this issue. Councilperson Parker asked could council vote to demolish the Food Pantry and make it a courtyard? Mayor Bennett asked Chris Morton if Clearwater could tear the building down. Mr. Morton stated that they could. Mayor Bennett stated that the building is in the Downtown Development Authority's name and the DDA would need to approve this prior to council's approval. Levis recommended to council that this issue starts with the DDA and they make a proposal to the city if they want the city to facilitate the destruction. Levis stated that the issue of cost could be addressed at that time.
4. Debbie Dubberly addressed the council regarding a drainage issue behind the Durden Hudson Mortuary. Ms. Dubberly stated in 2016 they had trees that fell over on the property directly behind their parking lot. Ms. Dubberly stated that this was due to the fact that the ditch had not been maintained properly. Ms. Dubberly stated that she spoke with the former city administrator Al Lawson and former Mayor Schwabe regarding the issue and was advised that the city's insurance would not cover those repairs. Ms. Dubberly stated that this year we had back to back tornadoes. Ms. Dubberly stated that a tree fell on her building. Ms. Durbberly presented pictures to council to review. Ms. Durbberly stated that her insurance is paying to make these repairs. Ms. Dubberly stated that where the issue came in was when they were removing the storage buildings it was brought to her attention that the concrete slab that is existing under the building labeled as building B the concrete blocks had washed down into the ditch. Ms. Durbberly stated that the other building, building A, has void under the concrete slab where the dirt has washed away. Ms. Dubberly stated that her contractor stated that the ground is not stable, and he cannot pour a slab there. Ms. Dubberly stated that she has a building and a carport that can not be installed. Ms. Dubberly stated that she has spoke with the city clerk, Mayor Bennett, and Chris Morton with Clearwater Solutions and they stated that the city does not have easements to the property where the ditch is located and cannot make repairs on private property. Ms. Dubberly stated that she is having to use offsite storage. Ms. Dubberly went to the clerk's office and got the easements. Ms. Dubberly stated that the city told her that the easements she has is not for that area. Ms. Dubberly stated that she spoke with her attorney with Jones Court LLC. She stated that it is likely that the city constructed and maintained this ditch as part of a storm water management and that if it was the case the city could not abandon it. Ms. Dubberly stated her attorney asked if the city had a storm water management program. Ms. Dubberly stated that these are questions that she has presented to the city administrator. Ms. Dubberly stated that several of the council members, city administrator, and Clearwater Solutions have all been out and looked at this damage. Ms. Dubberly stated that her attorney sited two cases 1. The city of College Park vs. Pichon 2. Peachtree City vs. Mooreset. Ms. Dubberly stated that if the city claims the right to use this drainage ditch, then it is under their duty to maintain it so that the content and flow of surface water would not overflow the damage of adjacent property owners. The court noted that abandonment by the city would be difficult where the purpose of the drainage easement had not become impossible. The city could not avoid repair and maintenance obligations by

merely abandoning the easement when confronted with repair costs. Ms. Dubberly stated that since speaking with the attorney she had also contacted Donaldson Land Surveys. Ms. Dubberly stated that he came by and looked at her deed, the Raco deed, and the Chalker deed. Ms. Dubberly stated what they were trying to determine was who owned the ditch. Ms. Dubberly stated that there are still some questions about that; however, Mr. Donaldson states that the deed only goes back to 1966 and there is a possibility that the easements attached do not apply to the drainage ditch. Donaldson stated that they would need the previous deed, belonging to the previous owner Frank Flanders to determine if there were easements. Ms. Dubberly stated Mr. Donaldson stated that there were numerous easements for Mr. Flanders on file and that she has a presumptive easement enforce. Ms. Dubberly stated she asked him what a presumptive easement was. Ms. Dubberly stated he said a presumptive easement occurs when the access or easement has been used for so many years that it has become an established easement. The owner's permission is not necessary if they allow it to go on for years without complaint. The law is clear about who has responsibility to maintain a presumptive easement. Basically, the person or party using an easement known as the easement holder has the duty to maintain it. Easement holders don't become owners of the land attached to that easement though within limits actual landowners retain the most right over it. Ms. Dubberly stated that we have more questions than answers at this time. Ms. Dubberly stated that the city had been using this drainage ditch since 1966 and before. Ms. Dubberly stated that they have not impeded the city in anyway from using that drainage ditch. Ms. Dubberly stated that it has been maintained by the city. It was maintained twice after the 2016 incident. Ms. Dubberly stated that the management had stopped, and it is overgrown to the point that the water cannot run off like it needs to. Ms. Dubberly stated that the city is using it and they are benefiting from the drainage of the storm water run off therefore the presumptive easement applies. Ms. Dubberly stated that the city is responsible for the upkeep, the maintenance, and any damage because of any neglect of that ditch. Ms. Dubberly stated at this point she has three requests: 1. That her property be restored to its previous useful and stable condition as soon as possible. 2. I request recompence for the additional cost of having to pay for offsite storage and other charges that she is incurring at this time. 3. Requesting reimbursement for 2016 incidents damages in the amount of \$10,000. City attorney, Levis, asked Ms. Dubberly if Cater Thompson was representing her in this matter? Ms. Dubberly stated that Cater Thompson had been her attorney since 2007 when she purchased the property. Ms. Dubberly stated she was not representing her on this matter at this time. Levis asked if this was a demand that she was making on the city at this time. Ms. Dubberly stated that this is a request. Levis stated to the council that he reviews this as a demand, and it falls under the case of potential litigation and advised council not to discuss this matter at this time. Councilperson Parker stated that there are two other issues similar to this on Robin Road and Brown Street. Councilperson Parker asked had we received a report from the engineer. The city clerk stated that council voted at the last meeting to send out RFQ's for Engineering Services. Councilperson Parker stated that this issue needs to be addressed. Mayor Bennett asked the attorney's recommendation of how to proceed. Levis stated that there is a demand for specific performance and financial compensation he views that as a legal demand that could result in pending litigation and therefore advise the council to discuss under pending litigation in executive session. Mayor Bennett stated that the city could get an easement from all three owners. Councilperson Sconyers made a motion that the city attorney draft easements for the three properties. Mayor Bennett asked if the city got the easements could Clearwater get the equipment in. Mr. Morton stated that they could not without removing trees.

**Motion by: Sconyers      Second: Stafford      Vote: 5-1**  
**For: Davis, Sconyers, Stafford, Parker, Collins      Against: Quarterman**

5. Fire Chief Strobridge presented a quote for uniforms in an estimated amount of \$2,800 and portable radios in the amount of \$1,204 for the two new firefighters. Councilperson Park made a motion to approve the purchases.

**Motion by: Parker      Seconded: Quarterman      Vote: 6-0**

6. Fire Chief Strobridge presented a quote for new pagers. Chief Strobridge presented two options one that is not compatible with the new county communication system and one



that will be compatible with the new system. Councilperson Parker made a motion to purchase the pagers compatible with the new county system at a cost of \$5,950.00. Councilperson Stafford asked could it be paid out of SPLOST monies. Council approved the expenditure out of SPLOST.

**Motion by: Parker                      Seconded: Davis                      Vote:6-0**

7. Fire Chief Strobridge presented a quote for Guardian Angel safety lights for the firefighters. Chief Strobridge stated that they have tested one of these lights and they help in identifying the location of the firemen in a burning building. Councilperson Parker made a motion to purchase the Guardian Angels in the amount of \$1,649.85.  
**Motion by: Parker                      Seconded: Davis                      Vote: 6-0**

8. Fire Chief Strobridge presented quotes to repair the roof at Fire Headquarters. Chief Strobridge presented three quotes.  
WDS Construction                      \$26,000  
Stanley Mills Construction                      \$31,000  
RoofU.S.                      \$41,000  
Motion was made to accept the WDS Construction bid contingent on the vendor supplying the proper paperwork.

**Motion by: Stafford                      Seconded: Parker                      Vote: 5-1**  
**For: Stafford, Parker, Sconyers, Collins                      Against: Davis**

9. City clerk Kirby presented a proposal from Appalachian Mountain Services to provide delinquents tax collection services. The clerk stated that this service is provided to the city at no upfront cost to the city. Clerk stated that this is the same company that the county uses. Clerk stated that the city will still have to send out the initial letter and issue a FIFA prior to the collection company pursuing collections. The clerk stated this will cut down on the upfront cost associated with title searching and deed preparation. The company will charge the customer \$60 per parcel to send out letters and \$180 per parcel if the property goes to the tax sale. Councilperson Stafford asked could we postpone this until the next meeting. Councilperson Davis made a motion to postpone this item until the next meeting. Levis stated that this would save some work and time on his end and other than the indemnification clause he doesn't have an issue with it.  
**Motion by: Davis                      Seconded: Sconyers                      Vote: 6-0**

10. Mayor Bennett presented the LOST allocation proposal from the county. The city's new LOST allocation will be 34%. Councilperson Stafford made a motion to accept the LOST allocation from the county.  
**Motion by: Stafford                      Seconded: Sconyers                      Vote: 6-0**

11. Councilperson Parker requested to amend the agenda to allow Ida McMillian to address the council.  
**Motion by: Parker                      Seconded: Stafford                      Vote: 6-0**

12. Ida McMillian stated that she had some questions that she would like clarification on. Ms. McMillian stated that on September 26 that the building at 417 Lewis Street was given to her by the city. Ms. McMillian stated that since the building was given to her, she considered it hers. Mayor Bennett stated that the problem is that it's not in the minutes anywhere stating that the building was given to her. Mayor Bennett stated that there is a procedure that must take place to properly dispose of city property.

**C. Committee Reports:**

1. None

**D. Executive Session:**

Councilperson Davis made a motion to go into executive session to discuss employment exception pursuant to O.C.G.A. 50-14-3(b)(2) and attorney-client privilege regarding pending litigation O.C.G.A. 50-14-2(1).  
**Motion by: Davis                      Seconded: Stafford                      Vote: 3-3**

**Mayor voted in favor of the motion.**

**CLOSING MEETING AFFIDAVIT**

Personally appeared before the undersigned attesting officer, duly authorized to administer oaths, the undersigned, who, after being duly sworn, depose and on oath state the following:

- (1) The Mayor/ Mayor Pro Tem was the presiding officer of a meeting of the Swainsboro City Council held on the 6<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2022.
- (2) That it is our understanding that O.C.G.A. § 50-14-2 provides as follows:

“This Chapter shall not be construed so as to repeal in any way:

(1) The attorney-client privilege recognized by state law to the extent that a meeting otherwise required to be open to the public under this chapter may be closed in order to consult and meet with legal counsel pertaining to pending or potential litigation, settlement, claims, administrative proceedings, or other judicial actions brought or to be brought by or against the agency or any officer or employee or in which the agency or any officer or employee may be directly involved; provided, however, the meeting may not be closed for advice or consultation on whether to close a meeting; and

(2) Those tax matters which are otherwise made confidential by State law.”

And that O.C.G.A. § 50-14-3 (a) provides as follows:

“This chapter shall not apply to the following:

- (1) Staff meetings held for investigative purposes under duties or responsibilities imposed by law;
- (2) The deliberations and voting of the State Board of Pardons and Paroles; and in addition such board may close a meeting held for the purpose of receiving information or evidence for or against clemency or in revocation proceedings if it determines that the receipt of such information or evidence in open meeting would present a substantial risk of harm or injury to a witness;
- (3) Meetings of the Georgia Bureau of Investigation or any other law enforcement or prosecutorial agency in the state, including grand jury meetings;
- (4) Adoptions and proceedings related thereto;
- (5) Gatherings involving an agency and one or more neutral third parties in mediation of a dispute between the agency and any other party. In such a gathering, the neutral party may caucus jointly or independently with the parties to the mediation to facilitate a resolution to the conflict, and any such caucus shall not be subject to the requirements of this chapter. Any decision or resolution agreed to by an agency at any such caucus shall not become effective until ratified in a public meeting and the terms of any such decision or resolution are disclosed to the public. Any final settlement agreement, memorandum of agreement, memorandum of understanding, or other similar document, however denominated, in which an agency has formally resolved a claim or dispute shall be subject to the provisions of Article 4 of Chapter 18 of this title;
- (6) Meetings:
  - (A) Of any medical staff committee of a public hospital;
  - (B) Of the governing authority of a public hospital or any committee thereof when performing a peer review or medical review function as set forth in Code Section 31-7-15, Articles 6 and 6A of Chapter 7 of Title 31, or under any other applicable federal or state statute or regulation; and
  - (C) Of the governing authority of a public hospital or any committee thereof in which the granting, restriction, or revocation of staff privileges or the granting of abortions under state or federal law is discussed, considered, or voted upon;
- (7) Incidental conversation unrelated to the business of the agency; or

- (8) E-mail communications among members of an agency; provided, however, that such communications shall be subject to disclosure pursuant to Article 4 of Chapter 18 of this title.”
- (3) Close Executive Sessions are permitted pursuant O.C.G.A. § 50-14-3(b) for:

“(1) Meetings when any agency is discussing or voting to:

- (A) Authorize the settlement of any matter which may be properly discussed in executive session in accordance with paragraph (1) of Code Section 50-14-2;
- (B) Authorize negotiations to purchase, dispose of, or lease property;
- (C) Authorize the ordering of an appraisal related to the acquisition or disposal of real estate;
- (D) Enter into a contract to purchase, dispose of, or lease property subject to approval in a subsequent public vote; or
- (E) Enter into an option to purchase, dispose of, or lease real estate subject to approval in subsequent public vote.

No vote in executive session to acquire, dispose of, or lease real estate, or to settle litigation, claims, or administrative proceedings, shall be binding on an agency until a subsequent vote is taken in an open meeting where the identity of the property and the terms of the acquisition, disposal, or lease are disclosed before the vote or where the parties and principal settlement terms are disclosed before the vote;

(2) Meetings when discussing or deliberating upon the appointment, employment, compensation, hiring, disciplinary action or dismissal, or periodic evaluation or rating of a public officer or employee or interviewing applicants for the position of the executive head of an agency. This exception shall not apply to the receipt of evidence or when hearing argument on personnel matters, including whether to impose disciplinary action or dismiss a public officer or employee or when considering or discussing matters of policy regarding the employment or hiring practices of the agency. The vote on any matter covered by this paragraph shall be taken in public and minutes of the meeting as provided in this chapter shall be made available. Meetings by an agency to discuss or take action on the filling of a vacancy in the membership of the agency itself shall at all times be open to the public as provided in this chapter;

(3) Meetings of the board of trustees or the investment committee of any public retirement system created by or subject to Title 47 when such board or committee is discussing matters pertaining to investment securities trading or investment portfolio positions and composition;

(4) Portions of meetings during which that portion of a record made exempt from public inspection or disclosure pursuant to Article 4 of Chapter 18 of this title is to be considered by an agency and there are no reasonable means by which the agency can consider the record without disclosing the exempt portions if the meeting were not closed; and

(5) Meetings when discussing or deliberating upon cybersecurity plans, procedures, and contracts regarding the provision of cybersecurity services. No vote in executive session to enter into a cybersecurity contract shall be binding on an agency until a subsequent vote is taken in an open meeting where the identity of the contractor and the terms of the agreement that are not subject to paragraph (25) of subsection (a) of Code Section 50-18-72 are disclosed before the vote.”

- (4) The subject matter of the closed meeting or closed portion of the meeting held on the 6<sup>th</sup> day of September 2022, which was closed for the purpose of:

\_\_\_\_\_ **ATTORNEY-CLEINT PRIVILEGE REGARDING PENDING LITIGATION**

**O.C.G.A. § 50-14-2(1)**

\_\_\_\_\_ **TAX MATTERS PURSUANT TO O.C.G.A. §50-14-2(2)**

\_\_\_\_\_ **STAFF MEETING HELD FOR INVESTIGATION PURSUANT TO O.C.G.A. §50-14-3(a)(1)**

\_\_\_\_\_ **DELIBERATION AND VOTING OF THE STATE BOARD OF PARDONS AND PAROLE PURSUANT TO O.C.G.A. §50-14-3(a)(2)**

- \_\_\_\_\_ LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY OR PROSECUTIONSL AGENCY O.C.G.A. §50-14-3(a)(3)
- \_\_\_\_\_ MEDIATION EXCEPTION PURSUANT TO O.C.G.A. § 50-14-3(a)(5)
- \_\_\_\_\_ HOSPITAL MEETINGS EXCEPTION PURSUANT TO O.C.G.A. § 50-14-3(a)(6)
- \_\_\_\_\_ INCIDENTAL CONVERSATION EXCEPTION PURSUANT TO O.C.G.A. § 50-14-3(a)(7)
- \_\_\_\_\_ SETTLEMENT EXCEPTION PURSUANT TO O.C.G.A. § 50-14-3(b)(1)(A)
- \_\_\_\_\_ PROPERTY NEGOTIATIONS PURSUANT TO O.C.G.A. § 50-14-3(b)(1)(B)
- \_\_\_\_\_ APPRAISAL EXCEPTION PURSUANT TO O.C.G.A. § 50-14-3(b)(1)(C)
- \_\_\_\_\_ CONTRACT EXCEPTION PURSUANT TO O.C.G.A. § 50-14-3(b)(1)(D)
- X   EMPLOYMENT EXCEPTION PURSUANT O.C.G.A. § 50-14-3(b)(2)
- \_\_\_\_\_ PUBLIC RETIREMENT SYSTEM PURSUANT TO O.C.G.A. §50-14-3(b)(3)
- \_\_\_\_\_ PROTECTION OF EXEMPTION PORTIONS OF RECORD PURSUANT TO O.C.G.A. § 50-14-3(b)(4)
- \_\_\_\_\_ CYBERSECURITY EXCEPTION PURSUANT TO O.C.G.A. § 50-14-3(b)(4).

(5) This affidavit is being executed for the purpose of complying with the mandate of O.C.G.A. 50-14-4(b) that such an affidavit be executed.

This 6<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2022.

\_\_\_\_\_

Greg Bennett, Mayor

\_\_\_\_\_

Julian Sconyers - Council Person

\_\_\_\_\_

Johnny Ray Stafford – Council Person

\_\_\_\_\_

Bobbie Collins – Council Person

\_\_\_\_\_

John E. Parker – Council Person

\_\_\_\_\_

D. J. Davis – Council Person

\_\_\_\_\_

Gregory Quarterman– Council Person

Sworn to and subscribed before me this

6<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2022.



\_\_\_\_\_  
NOTARY PUBLIC

My commission expires: \_\_\_\_\_

Councilperson Sconyers made a motion to return to regular session due to lack of quorum in executive session.

**Motion by: Sconyers                      Seconded: Davis                      Vote: 6-0**

Councilperson Quarterman made a motion to adjourn.

**Motion by: Quarterman                      Seconded: Parker                      Vote: 3-3**  
**For: Quarterman, Parker, Collins                      Against: Davis, Stafford, Sconyers**  
**Mayor broke tie in favor of motion.**

Submitted: ***Melissa Kirby***, City Administrator