

DRAFT

**FAYETTEVILLE CITY COUNCIL
WORK SESSION MINUTES
LAFAYETTE CONFERENCE ROOM
AUGUST 5, 2019
5:00 P.M.**

Present: Mayor Mitch Colvin

Council Members Katherine K. Jensen (District 1); Daniel Culliton (District 2) (arrived at 5:41 p.m.); Tisha S. Waddell (District 3); D. J. Haire (District 4); Johnny Dawkins (District 5); William J. L. Crisp (District 6); Larry O. Wright, Sr. (District 7); Theodore Mohn (District 8)

Absent: Council Member James W. Arp (District 9)

Others Present: Douglas Hewett, City Manager
Karen McDonald, City Attorney
Kristoff Bauer, Deputy City Manager
Telly Whitfield, Assistant City Manager
Angel Wright-Lanier, Assistant City Manager
Gina Hawkins, Police Chief
Sheila Thomas-Ambat, Public Services Director
John Larch, Stormwater Engineer
Tracey Broyles, Budget and Evaluation Director
Jay Toland, Chief Financial Officer
Alicia Young, Assistant City Attorney
Randy Hume, Transit Director
Cynthia Blot, Economic and Community Development
Director
Rebecca Jackson, Strategic Performance Analytics
Director
Gerald Newton, Development Services Director
Taurus Freeman, Planning and Zoning Manager
Craig Harmon, Senior Planner
Michael Gibson, Parks, Recreation and Maintenance
Director
Pamela Megill, City Clerk
Members of the Press

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Colvin called the meeting to order. Mayor Colvin announced the meeting will relocate to the Council Chamber as there are so many residents attending this meeting.

Mayor Colvin recessed the meeting at 5:02 p.m. and reconvened the meeting in the Council Chamber at 5:05 p.m.

2.0 INVOCATION

The invocation was offered by Council Member Wright.

3.0 APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION: Council Member Dawkins moved to approve the agenda with moving Items 4.02 and 4.03 before Item 4.01.

SECOND: Council Member Wright

VOTE: UNANIMOUS (8-0)

4.0 OTHER ITEMS OF BUSINESS

4.02 Continuum of Care and Homeless Day Center Update

Ms. Cynthia Blot, Economic and Community Development Director, introduced Ms. Larissa Witt, Chair of the Cumberland County Continuum of Care on Homelessness (Continuum of Care). Ms. Witt presented this item with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation. Ms. Witt provided an

DRAFT

overview of the make-up of the Continuum of Care and the network that surrounds it. The definition of Chronically Homeless is 12 months of homelessness or 4 episodes in 3 years plus a disabling condition. The homeless can be outside, in an emergency shelter, or transitional housing. There are several myths surrounding homelessness: people choose to be homeless, some have a long-term disability, some have mental health issues, and some have experienced domestic violence. Exposure to trauma is the one causative agent that all homeless adults have in common. The most effective treatment for trauma is a sense of safety which can come with acquiring independent housing. For the Housing First program, the must haves are Intensive Case Management and Temporary Financial Assistance. The Housing First program costs less than incarceration or residential treatment. The Housing First program is a homeless assistance approach that prioritizes providing permanent housing to people experiencing homelessness, thus ending their homelessness and serving as a platform from which they can pursue personal goals and improve their quality of life.

Discussion ensued.

Consensus of Council was to direct staff to reach out to the County elected officials to request a Liaison Committee meeting to discuss this item.

4.03 Vision Resource Center Transportation

Mr. Randy Hume, Transit Director, presented this item and stated Vision Resource Center (VRC) relocated its office to the Alphin House located at 2736 Cedar Creek Road. This site is outside our ADA service area (3/4 mile of a regular bus route). Transit staff has met with VRC officials several times to better understand the travel needs for activities planned at the new location. According to VRC, the Cedar Creek location allows them to host more events and activities than have been experienced at the Gilmore Center where FAST had very few trips specific to VRC. VRC also noted some of their events in the past had to be held at other locations due to space limitations. VRC has a fleet of two small buses and one minivan that it uses for some of its programs. They indicate they do not have sufficient budget to expand the use of these vehicles. FAST could extend its ADA service area an additional 3/4 mile to include the Alphin House although there are factors for Council to consider in addition to the added cost for VRC trips. Utilizing FASTTRAC! would require the ADA service to also accommodate trip requests from other persons with disabilities living within or traveling to that expanded area. ACS/Census data indicates there are 81 individuals with disabilities within this extended area mostly outside the City limits. Not all of these would be eligible for FASTTRAC! but even a small percentage of these can be expected to be ADA certified and then request trips adding significant cost to Transit's budget. Another consideration to extending the ADA area relates to other areas of the City that do not currently get FASTTRAC! service because of the 3/4 mile zone. Also, it should be noted the Cumberland County's Community Transportation Program (CTP) receives federal and state grant funding to provide services to elderly and disabled persons outside the FASTTRAC! service area. The County also receives a portion of FTA formula apportionments designated for the Fayetteville urbanized area. In FY 2019 and 2020, the County has been allocated \$78,000.00 in FTA urban formula funding and \$200,000.00 in FTA elderly and disabled funding.

Staff has met with VRC leadership, including VRC board members on multiple occasions to determine their transportation service needs. After a few iterations, VRC has narrowed its request to provide transportation options to their clients for a monthly "Family" meeting and twice weekly program activities to be held at the Cedar Creek location. It is clear these needs can be met using means other than FASTTRAC! at much less cost. The issue is who has budget resources available to assist with funding. The projected cost to extend FASTTRAC! to meet VRC needs as well as cover new ADA clients living in the expanded area is projected to be \$138,300.00 annually. This

DRAFT

includes \$94,000.00 for the new clients and \$44,300.00 for specific VRC trips. Fare revenues estimated to be \$7,340.00 resulting in leave net cost to fund of \$130,960.00. Special runs tailored to VRC needs can be provided at a much lower cost particularly if provided by the County's contract operator or if additional funding could be provided to VRC to utilize their own vehicles or even provide taxi reimbursements. These costs range from approximately \$23,500.00 to \$36,700.00 depending on who operates the services. County or VRC fare revenues are projected to be \$2,940.00 resulting in a net cost to fund of \$20,560.00 to \$33,760.00. Some FTA grant funding could be allocated to support the added cost. The federal percentage will also vary based on how the service is provided. FAST would generally be eligible for 50 percent FTA funding while the County may be eligible for 80 percent funding if the services were provided using federal elderly and disabled grant funding (Section 5310) similar to how the County uses this program now. It should be noted FAST may not use Section 5310 funds for FASTTRAC! service. These funds are for programs that are "over and above" ADA required services. If 80 percent grant funding were used, the required match for a project operated by the County's contractor or VRC directly (net annual cost of \$33,760.00) would be \$6,750.00 annually. With the City providing the service (net cost of \$44,300.00) with 50 percent FTA funding, the required grant match would be \$22,150.00. The local funding requirement under any of the options could be provided by anyone including the County, the City, VRC, others or a partnership of multiple organizations. With regards to the County's CTP, as noted before, the County receives both federal and state funding grants to assist in providing its services. The County uses its State funding to match the federal grants, so therefore the County budgets very little local County revenue for transit services. According to the National Transit Database report, in FY 17 the County's local funding for the CTP was \$62,946.00 or 7.9 percent of operating revenues. When working with FAMPO on the plan for allocating FTA urban formula funds, it was projected in FY 20, the County local funding would be \$63,300.00 or 6.4 percent of the operating revenues. We do not have details for the County's FY 20 budget as it relates to the CTP operation.

Mr. Hume asked if this is a City responsibility. He stated there is nothing that prohibits the City from providing service outside its current service area. The County CTP receives state and federal grant funds to provide service to this area as well as similar areas within Cumberland County. It also appears the County or VRC could provide the services identified by VRC at a lower cost than FAST. The primary issue is funding. None of the service options have been included in the City's FY 20 annual budget.

Discussion ensued.

Consensus of Council was to direct the City Manager to send a formal letter to Cumberland County Board of Commissioners Chair regarding the funding for this request from the Vision Resource Center for transportation.

Mayor Colvin recessed the meeting at 6:48 p.m. and reconvened the meeting at 6:58 p.m.

4.01 Murchison Road Study Proposal in Conjunction with Fayetteville State University

Dr. Burcu Adivar, Fayetteville State University Professor, presented this item with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and stated this proposal would be providing citizens with the opportunity to live in well-planned, resilient, and well-managed communities and is a top priority for Fayetteville's City Council members. The Broadwell College of Business and Economics (BCBE) at Fayetteville State University proposes a multi-term project to better understand community perspectives about the planned revitalization of the Murchison Road Corridor. These community perspectives would be drawn

DRAFT

from a wide array of internal and external stakeholders including educational institutions (EE Smith High School, FSU, Westarea, and Ferguson-Easley Elementary Schools), the City of Fayetteville, and the business community.

The project will examine (1) community survey results to establish a "quality of life" profile and (2) critical infrastructure and future projections to produce a vulnerability and risk assessment. Simulation models will be developed to evaluate cascading impacts along with the consequences of alternative response scenarios. Several recent studies have examined Cumberland County, Fayetteville, and the Murchison Road Corridor including the (1) Economic and Business Development Strategic Action Plan by RedRock Global (2016), (2) Harvard University rankings (2015), and (3) the Mobility Study Phase I and II (2008). Collectively, the studies address the need for action to eliminate poverty and to improve the quality of life for residents.

The study would create a custom definition of "quality of life" for the Murchison Road community. The research methodology would include:

- (1) A pre-survey to develop a benchmark for community expectations.
- (2) Comparison data for communities with similar socioeconomic demographics and infrastructure.
- (3) Gap analysis.
- (4) Strategies to contribute to revitalization efforts.
- (5) Sharing results in town hall meetings with community residents.
- (6) Submission and presentation of final results.

Dr. Burcu stated the estimated total cost of the proposal is \$156,491.00.

Mayor Colvin asked if the program could be divided into separate sections, as the City may not need parts of the program. Dr. Burcu agreed that the program could be divided.

Discussion ensued.

Consensus of Council was to direct the City Manager to review the proposal and offer a counter proposal as there may be parts of the proposal that we already have in place, or do not need.

MOTION: Council Member Crisp moved to move Item 4.08 as the next item due to the number of residents in attendance for this item.

SECOND: Council Member Wright

VOTE: UNANIMOUS (9-0)

4.08 City Council Member Agenda Item Request - Request for Traffic Calming Measures in the Green Valley Community - Council Member Haire

Council Member Haire presented this item and stated he had met with the residents of the Green Valley Community Watch and they are very concerned about speeding in their neighborhood and are requesting traffic calming measures (speed bumps and stop signs) to provide additional safety.

Mayor Colvin asked what the basis is for denying the Green Valley residents' request. Mr. Douglas Hewett, City Manager, stated Traffic Services conducted an investigation, and found that the conditions do

DRAFT

not meet the traffic control standards for the installation of a "stop" sign to control neighborhood concerns regarding speeding; therefore they were unable to move forward with the Community Watch request. Also, the accident report history investigation found there was one reported accident in the five-year period of March 1, 2014, through March 1, 2019.

Discussion ensued.

Consensus of Council was to direct professional staff to meet with Council Members Haire and Dawkins to review the Residential Traffic Management Program Policies, Code of Ordinances, Motor Vehicles and Traffic Article V - Official Traffic Control Devices and report back to Council with policy review report and options.

Council then proceeded to Item 4.04.

4.04 Drainage Assistance Program

Mr. John Larch, Assistant City Engineer, presented this item with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and stated Stormwater infrastructure consists of a network of catch basins, drop inlets, swales, pipes, and stormwater control measures (SCMs) that carry stormwater runoff away from roadways and property, ultimately discharging it into creeks and streams. A great deal of this infrastructure is maintained by the City, but a large portion is located on private property and considered the responsibility of property owners. Council recently approved a revision to the Stormwater ordinance that acknowledges the City's responsibility for maintaining stormwater infrastructure within the City right-of-way. The ordinance also provides for the City Council to address stormwater problems outside of the City right-of-way through a drainage assistance program administered by City staff.

Staff is seeking policy direction from Council in two critical areas of implementation for the new drainage assistance program: eligibility and priority, and cost share. Staff will discuss alternatives for "cost share" with the Storm Water Advisory Board (SWAB) during an August meeting to be scheduled and will bring that recommendation to Council for discussion during the September 3, 2019, work session. The City needs to establish eligibility criteria that will determine what requests will move forward to potentially become projects. Those requests that move forward will then be prioritized based on key aspects of the project, such as its potential to improve safety, protect property, improve overall system performance, etc. A list of prioritized projects, along with the program budget, will then be provided to the SWAB for review and approval. The draft eligibility criteria developed by staff includes requirements and exclusions. To be considered for the program, a request must be able to answer "yes" to the following questions about requirements:

- Has requestor paid the evaluation fee (if required*)?
- Is there existing drainage infrastructure on the property?
- Will property owners authorize the City to do work without compensation?
- Will property owners acknowledge the City will not take ownership of any drainage infrastructure installed on their property?

The request must also answer "no" to the following exclusion questions:

- Is the request for the benefit of a commercial property?
- Is the property undergoing development or re-development?

DRAFT

- Does the request consist only of aesthetic maintenance (removal of brush, mowing of grass, litter pick-up, etc.)?
- Does the request consist solely of bank stabilization?
- Is the request asking for repair or replacement of drainage infrastructure on a private road?
- Is the flooding only present during events larger than City design criteria such as hurricanes, unusually severe thunderstorms, etc.?
- Will the problem be addressed by an existing CIP project which is funded and scheduled for construction?

Once a request has been deemed eligible, it will then be evaluated for ranking by applying a scoring system based on various characteristics of the potential project. The staff will apply the same scoring system currently used to rank City stormwater projects inside the right-of-way to ensure consistency for residents. It should be noted that as part of the watershed master planning study, the scoring system will be reviewed and potentially updated. On an annual basis, staff will provide the SWAB with a list of project descriptions, along with their costs and the program budget, for review and approval. Upon approval, projects will be designed and constructed as part of the existing stormwater project management process. In order to quickly implement the Drainage Assistance Program, an engineering consulting firm will be retained upon Council approval of the eligibility criteria. The firm will review the existing backlog of off right-of-way requests. Eligible requests will either be packaged as a contract or ranked for review by the SWAB. Staff anticipates having an initial contract prepared by November 2019 to address smaller requests and a prioritized list provided to the SWAB by January 2020. Going forward, City staff will assume responsibility for the program. The approved FY 20 budget includes funding to support implementation for the drainage assistance program.

Discussion ensued.

Consensus of Council was to direct staff to move this item forward and to bring the item back to the Council at the September 3, 2019, work session with more specifics.

4.05 City Council Member Agenda Item Request - Update on "Adopt a Block" Trees on Murchison Road Beautification - Mayor Colvin

Mayor Colvin introduced this item and stated he had recently met with the new director of the Arts Council and the "Adopt a Block" program is something the City could possibly partner with the Arts Council; it would be tangible to buy into. Mayor Colvin said talks are still underway and this is just to keep you posted that we are working on some collaborative type of beautification for the area.

4.06 Council Member Agenda Item Request - Shopping Cart Blight - Mayor Colvin

Mayor Colvin presented this item and stated he has noticed there are multiple shopping carts around the City that have been dumped at various locations to include bus shelters, and sidewalks. This is blight in our City. Our Transit Department has been picking up these abandoned carts; this is not their job. We need to ask the grocery stores that these carts belong to, to be responsible for their property.

Discussion ensued.

Mr. Douglas Hewett, City Manager, stated staff has already conducted a significant amount of research and we can bring back

DRAFT

options to the Council. The Mayor asked the City Manager to send the research/information he has gathered to the City Council.

4.07 Council Member Request Item - Stormwater Policy - Council Member Dawkins

This item was not presented.

5.0 ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 8:57 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,