



## Investigation Summary

Town of Glen Alpine, NC

Issue Date: March 31, 2025

---

On September 17, 2024, the North Carolina Office of the State Auditor (OSA) received four allegations related to the Town of Glen Alpine (Town). Pursuant to North Carolina General Statutes §§147-64.6(C)(16) and 147-64.6B, OSA initiated an investigation into these allegations. During the investigation, OSA received two additional allegations related to the Town, which were also investigated.

On March 24, 2025, OSA held an Exit Conference with the Town Mayor, the Town's Board of Aldermen, the Town Manager, the Town's Attorney, and the Town clerk.

A summary of the allegations received, the investigation of these allegations, as well as additional findings are below.

**Allegation #1:** The Town paid their interim Chief of Police overtime pay as opposed to providing him with compensatory time.

The Town's Personnel Policy contains an overtime policy that outlines employee compensation, including for overtime, based on their status and in part states: "Exempt employees in administrative, professional, or managerial positions shall work the number of hours necessary to assure the satisfactory performance of their duties." We found that the Town does not maintain documentation indicating whether employees are considered exempt and non-exempt. Therefore, we were unable to determine whether the interim Chief of Police should have been provided with overtime pay or compensatory time.

Based on a lack of available records maintained by the Town, we were unable to substantiate this allegation.

We recommend the Town maintain records documenting whether an employee is exempt or non-exempt.

**Allegation #2:** The Town's Board of Aldermen holds meetings without providing public notice.

According to Town officials, notice of public meetings is provided at Town Hall, the Town's post office, and on Facebook. Investigators were able to confirm that the Town announces public meetings on Facebook. In fact, all regular scheduled meetings for 2025 were posted on the Town's Facebook page on December 19, 2024.

Based on the information reviewed, we determined that this allegation was unsubstantiated.

**Allegation #3:** An employee used compensatory time they had not earned.

We found that the Town does not maintain a record of accrued compensated absences. The employee who processes payroll maintains the accrual of compensated absences on a spreadsheet, which is overwritten every month. In addition, because the Town does not maintain documentation indicating whether employees are considered exempt or non-exempt, we were unable to determine if the employee should be earning compensatory time or be paid overtime.

Based on a lack of available records maintained by the Town, we were unable to substantiate this allegation.

We recommend that the Town maintain documentation of accrued compensated absences. Additionally, we recommend the Town segregate duties so that the same person who processes payroll does not maintain the accrued compensated absences spreadsheet.

**Allegation #4:** Members of the Town's Board of Aldermen tried to convince another Board member that a certain individual should be appointed as the full-time police chief.

We did not investigate this allegation as it does not contain elements of fraud, waste, or abuse of public funds; however, we do note that during a special Board meeting on September 30, 2024, all Board members present voted to approve the new police chief.

**Allegation #5:** The Town purchased \$1,000 worth of gravel for a public event without the approval of the Board of Aldermen.

The Town does not have purchasing policies and procedures; therefore, it is unclear at what dollar threshold purchases need to be submitted for approval to the Town's Board.

Based on a lack of available records maintained by the Town, we were unable to substantiate this allegation.

We recommend that the Town develop purchasing policies and procedures which clearly define the purchasing process, including when approval from the Board is required.

**Allegation #6:** The Town Attorney had a conflict of interest when he sold the Town property that he had partial ownership in.

While we found the property the Town purchased was partially owned by the Town's attorney, the attorney that represented the Town in the sale of the property was employed in a different law firm than the Town Attorney. It is important to note the Board unanimously approved the purchase of the property in question.

Based on the information reviewed, we determined that this allegation was unsubstantiated.

**Note to Readers:**

We note that this investigation was not exhaustive and OSA cannot guarantee the absence of any wrongdoing. Furthermore, this investigation does not preclude the possibility of future allegations, whether similar or different in nature, from being subject to investigation or audit by OSA.

A copy of this Investigation Summary has been provided to Town Leadership and is published online for review by Town Leadership, Town citizens, and the citizens of North Carolina.